The Nullity of the Romish Faith.

OR

A BLOW

At the Root of the

Romish Church;

BEING

An Examination of that Fundamental Doctrine of the CHURCH of *ROME* concerning the Churches INFALLIBILITIE, and of all those several Methods which their most famous and approved Writers have used for the defence thereof.

TOGETHER WITH

An APPENDIX tending to the Demonstration of the Solidity of the PROTESTANT FAITH, wherein the Reader will find all the Material Objections and Cavils of their most considerable Writers, viz. *Richworth* (alias *Rushworth*) in his Dialogues, *White* in his Treatise *de fide* and his *Apology for Tradition*, *Cressy* in his *Exomologesis*, S. *Clara* in his *Systema fidei*, and Captain *Everard* in his late account of his pretended Conversion to the Church of *Rome* discussed and answered.

By MATHEW POOLE Minister of the Gospel.

The fourth Edition.

OXFORD,
Printed by *Hen: Hall* Printer to the *University*, for *Ri: Davis*. 1671.

OF

To the Right Honourable

ARTHUR Earl *of* DONEGAL *Lord Viscount* Chichester, *of* Carickfergus, Baron *of* Belfast, *one of his* MAJESTIES *most Honourable Privy Councellours for his Kingdom of Ireland.*

My LORD,

HOw much it concernes every man to be rightly informed in the Controversies between *Rome* and Us, is sufficiently evident from the great importance they have in reference to our everlasting state. The Papists think the Protestant Doctrine is dangerous to Salvation, and the Protestants know the Popish Doctrine to be so: For although they use confidently to give it out to their Partisans, that their Religion is a safe way in the judgment of Protestants themselves; and though in former times of ignorance God might wink at some members of the Church of *Rome* that held the foundation, although they built a great deal of Hay and Stubble upon it: Yet since the late Edition of several new Articles of their Creed, and the contempt of that clear and glorious light of Gospel discoveries shining in the discourses and Writings of Protestant Authors, I cannot (and I fear God will not) excuse them from that hainous crime of rebelling against the light, or witholding it in unrighteousnesse, and, as Christ said to the Jewes, they have now no cloak for their Sins.

What the portion is of the followers of Antichrist we may more safely understand from the Testimony of God than from the conjectures of men: of them we read that *they shall be damned*, 2 Thes. 2. 12. That *their names are not written in the book of Life*, Rev. 13. 8. That *they shall drink of the Wine of the wrath of God*, —and *shall be tormented with Fire and Brimstone*,—and *the smoak of their Torment shall ascend evermore*, and *they shall have no rest day nor night which worship the Beast and his Image*, Rev. 14. 9, 10, 11.

The onely doubt is, whether the Papists be followers of Antichrist, or (which comes to one) whether the Pope be Antichrist; which seemed so probable to the famous Lord *Bacon*, that being asked by King JAMES whether he thought him so to be, it was no lesse truely then wittily answered by Him, That if an hue and cry should come after Antichrist, which should describe him by those Characters by which he is decyphered in the Bible, he should certainly apprehend the Pope for him. And I desire all Papists, who would not venture their Eternal Salvation upon uncertainties, to do our Cause and their own Soules that justice, as to peruse the Authors of both sides, *viz. Whitaker* and *Downham* on the one, and *Bellarmine* and *Lessius* on the other, and then I doubt not but they will conclude the notorious weaknesse of their Cavils or pretended Answers to our Allegations, to be at least an high presumption of the truth of our Assertion, if not sufficient to put an end to all further doubtings.

My Lord,

It is no small evidence of a good cause, and felicity of our Protestant people, that they are permitted to see with their own Eyes, and are both allowed and warned by their Teachers, not to take matters of Salvation upon trust, but to enquire and search the Scripture and other Authors, whether those things be true or no, whilst unhappy

happy Papiſts like the *Andabatæ* of old, muſt wink and fight, and are obliged with an implicit Faith to follow their guides in ſpight of Chriſts caution uſed upon the like occaſion, *If the blind lead the blind both ſhall fall into the Ditch*, Matth. 15. 14. Proteſtant Miniſters beſpeak their hearers in St. *Pauls* language, *I ſpeak to wiſe men judge ye what I ſay*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. While Popiſh prieſts, if they would ſpeak out, muſt ſay, *I ſpeak as to fools, believe all that I ſay:* A plaine ſign their Gold is adulterate becauſe they dare not ſuffer it to come to the Touch-ſtone.

My Lord,

In the handling of theſe Controverſies I thought it moſt prudent and ingenious to follow the Counſel which *Benhadad* gave to his Souldiers, to fight neither with ſmall nor great, but with the King of *Iſrael*, and therefore I did not mind the branches, but have indeavoured to ſtrike at the Root: For ſuch is the Doctrine here diſcuſſed, *viz.* the Doctrine of the Churches Authority and Infallibility, and ſo it is acknowledged by all the Romaniſts, and we are adviſed by them (if we mean to do any good) to attaque them in this point. I like the Counſel, and therefore have reſolved *ad Orcum arcem petere*, to attempt their ſtrongeſt Hold. All the Controverſies of the Church of *Rome* have (what *Caligula* wiſhed all the people of *Rome* had) one Neck, and that is this of the Churches infallible Authority: while this is ſafe, we doe but pair their Nailes, and cut their Hair, which will quickly grow again; but if this failes all falls, wound them here, and it goes to the Heart. Whether I have done this here or no, I ſhall not be ſo abſurd or arrogant as to give judgment in my own cauſe, this onely I ſhall be bold to ſay, that I have faithfully repreſented the ſtrength of the Popiſh cauſe in this great point out of their moſt famous and approved Authors,

and such of whom it may be truely said, *Si mœnia Romæ Defendi possent dextrâ hac defensa fuissent*, and therefore if all the plausible pretences of their most considerable Writers be here removed & destroyed, (which I willingly refer to the judgment of the serious intelligent and impartial Reader) I may without injustice conclude, that their Doctrine is indefensible, and their cause desperate.

My Lord,

The reason why I devolve the Patronage of this Work upon your Lordship is not onely the consideration of your real worth, and those honourable qualities resplendent in you, the true generosity, sincere friendship, obliging sweetnesse, impartial valuation of persons according to their merit, not their party or opinion in little things, and other conspicuous virtues (which they that have the happinesse of your acquaintance are witnesses of,) nor is it onely the known excellency and exemplary piety of your most Illustrious Lady which thing but ignorance or malice can deny,) nor the particular obligations which I shall alwayes desire to owne to both of you, but the contemplation of that great interest, which by the high capacity of your place, and the nobleness of your Estate, and the unexampled affability of your deportment, you have in the Kingdom of *Ireland*; which how free it is from other Venoms your Lordship knows better than I, yet sure I am it is sadly infected with the Poyson of Popish Doctrines, and therefore I thought the Anditode most needful there, and that your Lordships Authority and Influence accompanied with your zealous endeavours (which God expects, and I promise to my self from you in so good a cause) might induce many persons of the Romish perswasion to read and consider this short Treatise: *if God peradventure may give them Repentance to the acknowledgment of the Truth that they may recover themselves from the snare of the Devil.*

That

That God would encline your heart to contribute your most effectual help to so good a work, and succeed you in it, and recompence you for it, and that God would blesse your Self and worthy Lady with all the blessings you want, & mercifully preserve and sanctifie to you all you have, and crown all with those inexpressible felicities of another World, is now and shall, by Gods assistance be the humble and fervent prayer of

Sept. 1. 1665.

My Lord,

Your Lordships Orator at the Throne of Grace

MATTHEW POOLE.

To the Reader.

BEfore I come to the work it self, I know my Reader will require satisfaction in two things, which I hold my self obliged to give, in the first to the Protestant, in the latter to the Romanist. 1. *It will be objected to me as the Jewish Tradition tels us was objected to* Moses *by his Antagonists, who charged him with bringing Magical Operations among them, that he brought Straw into Ægypt, a Country abounding with Corn: so it will be said that I trouble the World with needless Repetitions, that I write an* Iliad *after* Homer, *and do that work which hath long since been done much better by our Protestant* Heroes, *and that* Nil dictum est quod non est dictum prius: *and particularly that this point of Infallibility hath been discussed by that formidable Adversary of Rome the most acute* Mr. Chillingworth, Lord Falkland, Dr. Hammond, *and lately by our Learned* Mr. Stillingfleet. *To these my Apologie is,* 1. *That the clamorous importunity of Popish Writers doth force us to the Repetitions, it being the Practice of most of their present Controvertists boldly to urge those things in English as unanswerable, which they know have been so solidly disproved in Latine, that they neither can nor have pretended to answer.* 2. *I have made it my indeavour as much as I could to avoid Repetitions, which are as displeasing to me as they can be to the Reader, which if I have in many places stumbled upon, it hath rather been the Necessity of the Thing, or an unhappy Chance, than Choice and Design.* 3. *The Reader I hope will find*

find have wrote: if I had known of any Author, who had in so short a compasse and plain Method contracted and dissolved the strength of the Popish cause in this great point, I had willingly superseded; nor did I intrude my self into this work, but was invited to it by diverse worthy and learned friends, and afterwards incouraged in it by the approbation of such persons, whose judgments I think almost all the learned part of England doth reverence. 4. Here is a new plea viz. concerning the sufficiency of the testimonie of the present Church and the Infallibility of Oral Tradition (not at all considered by Mr. Chillingworth, nor fully discussed by any other that I know of, (except the ingenuous Lord Falkland, who handles it quite another way, and hath left room for some Gleanings after his harvest.) Nor is it debated by Mr. Stillingfleet, whose Adversaries led him to things of another nature. And besides it is known to diverse, that this Treatise was prepared for the Presse before Mr. Stillingfleet's excellent Discourse came out, though retarded by some unhappy occurrences which it is needlesse here to recount.

The second particular is this: The Papists will pretend, that the Doctrines I charge upon them, and the Testimonies which I alleadge against them, are onely the particular opinions of private Doctors, and not of their whole Church. My defence is this.

1. The Authors which are here introduced, are not pedantick Writers, but such as are of prime note and highest esteem in the Church of Rome, and the most zealous & considerable Champions of their Cause, and such (for the generality of them) whose writings came forth with the Character of their Churches approbation upon them, concerning whom it will be very difficult to perswade any intelligent man, either that such persons did not understand the sense of the Church of Rome (as well as the Objector) or that they did knowingly contradict the doctrine of their Church, or would be permitted so to do without any censure upon them.

2 The

2. *The Testimonies of those Authors are undoubtedly sufficient for that end for which I alleadge them, which is to shew the falsenesse of those doctrines, and the weakenesse of those arguments which are disbelieved and disproved by their own learnedest and stoutest Champions, by which it may appear to all impartial persons, that it is not the ignorance nor prejudice of Protestants, (as some of their Writers have the Effrontery to assert) which make them reject the Popish Tenets, but meerly the want of Truth and evidence therein, confessed (as you will see all along in the following Treatise) by their own Brethren, and that it is a desperate madnesse in any Papist to hazard his everlasting concernments upon such principles, as so many of their acutest Scholars do publickly disavow: And that this is really the case of the unhappy Romanist, I refer thee to the subsequent Discourse.*

The

The Nullity of the Romish Faith.

The Introduction.

All Papists professe to resolve their Faith into, and to ground it upon the Churches infallible Testimony and supreme Authority. But when they come to explicate what they mean by the Church, and on what account they ground their faith upon her, then they fall into diverse opinions. By the Church some understand the Antient Church, whose Testimony is expressed in the Writings of the Fathers; others, the present Church, whose living Testimony and Authority they say is sufficient without any further enquirie. And this present Church too they cannot yet agree what it is: some say the Pope, others a generall Councel, and others the Pope and a Councel together. Nor are they lesse at variance about the grounds on which they build the Churches Authority. This some lay in the Testimonie of Scripture, others in the Authority of the Fathers, others in universal oral Tradition, others in the motives of Credibility (as we shall see in the process of this discourse. My purpose is to discover the rottennesse of these several foundations as they make use of them, and to shew that they have no solid foundation for their Faith in any of these recited particulars: and for more orderly proceeding I shall lay down six Propositions.

1 *That a Papists faith hath no solid foundation in the authority and infallibility of the Pope.* 2. *Nor in the Scriptures according to their principles.* 3 *Nor in the authoritie*

rity of Fathers. 4. *Nor in the infallibility of the Church and Councels.* 5. *Nor in unwritten Tradition, and the authoritie of the present Church.* 6. *Nor in the motive of Credibility. Of which in order.*

CHAP. I.

Of the Popes Authority and Infallibility.

Sect. 1. *Propos.* 1. *THe Popes infallible authoritie is in it self of no validity, and is a meer nullity further then it is established or corroborated by the rest.* This needs no great proof. For if I should ask any Papist why he rather relies upon the decisions of the Bishop of *Rome*, than the Bishop of *York*; the onely plea is, that the Bishop of *Rome* is St. *Peters* successor, & established by God in those royalties and jurisdictions, which St. *Peter* is supposed to have been invested with. But if I ask how this appears, what prooses and evidences there are of this assertion (upon which hangs the whole Masse and Fabrick of Popery?) there is no man so grosly absurd, to believe himself, or to affirm that I am bound to believe this barely upon the Popes assertion, that he is *Peters* successor. But for the proof of this, I am by the learned Romanist referred unto some passages of Scripture: as, *Thou art Peter, Feed my sheep*, &c. unto Tradition, and the Testimony of Fathers, and acts of Councels, that have either devolved this power upon, or acknowledged and confirmed it in the Bishops of *Rome*: from whence it undeniably followes, that the Popes αὐτὸς ἔφη, or naked affirmation of his own Authority (though delivered *ex Cathedra*, and with all imaginable formalities) is of no weight in it self, and hath no strength, nor virtue in it further then it is supported & demonstrated from such Testimonies of Scrip-

ture

tures, Fathers, or Councels. Which will further appear from this consideration: That upon supposition, that the Scripture had been silent as to *Peters* supremacy, and the Fathers and Councels had said nothing concerning the succession of the Bishops of *Rome* in St. *Peters* chaire, but had ascribed the same priviledges, which they are pretended to attribute to the Pope, to the Bishop of *Antioch*, I say upon this supposition, the Popes pretences would have been adjudged extremely presumptuous, and wholly ridiculous. From this then we have gained thus much, That the Popes Authority and Infallibility being the thing in question, and but a superstruction upon those other forementioned foundations, and not [illegible], or credible for it self, that it is not in it self a sufficient foundation for a Papists faith. And so that must be quitted as impertinent to the present enquiry, and we must go to the other particulars, and examine whether a Papist without any reference to, or dependance upon the Popes Authority or infallibility, can find a solid foundation for his faith either in Scriptures, Fathers, Councels, Tradition, or the motives of Credibility: And if I can shew, that the Papists, according to their own principles, cannot have a solid and sure ground for their faith in any of the now mentioned particulars, or if I can shew, that all their other pretensions, according to the principles of the most and learned'st Papists, depend upon this Authority of the Pope, and without it are no solid foundation of faith, that Scriptures, Fathers, Councels, and Tradition, are not conclusive nor obliging to me to believe, without the Popes Authority and Interpretation, (which I think will be made evident in the following discourses) then I may truely conclude, that they have no foundation for their faith. Therefore I passe on to the second head.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the Authority of Scripture according to Romish Principles.

Prop. 2. Sect. 1. *That the Scripture in it self, without the Interpretation, Testimonie, and Authority of the Church, is not a sufficient foundation of Faith for private Christians according to the Doctrine of the Romanists.* This is so plain, so often asserted by them, so universally owned, so vehemently urged in all their Treatises, that if there were not an horrible perverseneſse and tergiversation in that sort of men (who indeed by the badneſse of their cauſe are forced to say and unsay, give and recall, affirme and deny the same things as occasion requires, and the strength of an Argument forceth them:) I might superſede from any further pain or trouble therein, I shall therefore onely observe two principles of the Popish Creed, either of which (and much more both put together) do plainly and undeniably evince, that according to their Hypotheſes the Scripture in it self is no solid ground nor foundation of a Christian faith. 1. That a Christian cannot know, and is not bound to believe any, or all of the Books of Scripture to be the Word of God, without the Churches Witneſse and Authority. 2. That the senſe of Scripture is so obscure and ambiguous in the Articles of Faith, that a Christian cannot discover it without the Churches interpretation.

§. 2. For the first of these, it may suffice at present to mention two or three passages out of their approved Writers. *Baily* the Jeſuite, in his Catechiſme of Controverſies made by the command of the Archbiſhop of *Burdeaux*

Bordeaux, puts this Question. (a) *To whom doth it belong to determine of Canonical Books?* and answers thus. *To the Church, without whose Authority I should no more believe* St. Matthew *than* Titus Livius. When *Brentius* alledged the saying of a Papist; That if the Scriptures were destitute of the Churches Authority, they would weigh no more than *Æsops* Fables; the Cardinal *Hosius* replies, (b) *That these words may be taken in a plain sense; for in truth* (saith he) *unlesse the Authority of the Church did teach us that this Scripture were Canonical, it would have very little weight with us.* So *Charron* plainly tels us, (c) *That the Scripture hath no Authority, no weight or force towards us, and our faith, but for the Churches assertion and declaration.* *Andradius* in expresse termes denies (d) *that there is any thing of Divinity in the Scripture, which binds us to believe the things therein contained, but the Church, which teacheth us, that those Books are Sacred, none can resist without the highest impiety.* One may well cry out—*Heu pietas, heu prisca fides!* To disbelieve the Scripture, that is no impiety, but to resist the Church, that is the highest impiety: To make God a lyar, that is no impiety, but to make the Church a lyar that is impiety in the highest. You see now the reason why Violations of the Churches Authority are more severely punished

(a) Doctor Jesuita *Ad quem pertinet de libris Canonicis determinare?* Catholicus Papista. *Ad Ecclesiam, sine cuius authoritate, non plus fidei adhiberem* Matthæo *quàm* Tito Livio, *par.* 1. *q* 12. (b) *Potuit illud pio sensu dici— Nam revera nisi nos Ecclesiæ doceret authoritas hanc Scripturam esse Canonicam, perexiguum apud nos pondus haberet, de authoritate Scripturæ contra* Brentium. *lib.* 3. *f. l.* 171. (c) *Scriptura nullam habet authoritatem, nullum pondus, nullam vim erga nos & nostram fidem, nisi quod Ecclesia dicit & declarat.* Charron *vers.* 3.
(d) *Neque in Scripturis quicquam inesse divinitatis, quæ nos ad credendum, quæ illis continentur, religione aliqua constringat, at Ecclesiæ, quæ codices illos sacros esse docet—nemo sine gravissima impietatis nota possit repugnare.* Defens. Trident, lib. 2.

at

at *Rome*, then the groſſeſt tranſgreſſions of Gods lawes, becauſe there is more impiety in them, and ſo more ſeverity ſhould be exerciſed againſt them. And *Pighius* uſeth no leſſe freedome, telling us, (a) *That the Scriptures have no Authoritie with us either from themſelves, or from their Authors, but merely from the Churches Teſtimony.* Thus you ſee, that according to the ſyſteme of Popiſh Theology, the Scripture doth not diſcover it ſelf to be the Word of God, nor oblige my faith, unleſſe it bring along with it the Churches Letters of Credence. And whereas in St. *Paul's* dayes, neither Church nor Apoſtle was believed further then they brought Credentials from Scripture, *Acts* 17. 11. and St. *Auſtin* in his daies, in his Controverſies with the Donatiſts, batters down their Church by this Argument, that they could not ſhew it in, nor prove it from the Authority of Scriptures: now on the contrary the Scripture is not to be received, unleſſe it be confirmed by the Churches Authority: And as *Tertullian* argued of old, (b) *God ſhall not be God, without mans conſent.* It is here, as in dealings between man and man, if I ſay to ſome unknown perſon recommended to me by one whom I know and truſt, I ſhould not believe your profeſſions of honeſty (for I know you not) were it not for the teſtimony which my worthy friend gives of you: in this caſe, the mans profeſſions of Honeſty are not the ground of my faith or confidence in him, but onely my friends Teſtimony. Or as if a learner in Philoſophy ſhould ſay to his Tutor, I ſhould not believe that to be true, which I read in my Book, that the Earth moves, were it not for the reverence I bear to your deep judgment and great abilities. Here it is

(a) *Scripturæ, niſi ab Eccleſia accepto veritatis teſtimonio, nullam, ex ſeipſis aut ſuis authoribus, apud nos authoritatem habent.* Lib. 1. Hierarchio cap. 2. (b) *Nec Deus erit, niſi homini placuerit.*

plaine

plain, the reading in this book is not the foundation of his faith or perswasion, but onely the reverence he bears to his Teacher. And just this (say they) is the case of the Scripture, to which purpose they alleadg and own those words of *Austin*, (though they pervert the sense,) (a) *I should not believe the Gospel, unless the Churches Authority did move me.* Which if true in their sense, then the Churches Authority is the sole foundation of my Faith, and without it the Scripture is a meer Cypher, or at least not sufficient to command, or ground my Faith, which was the thing to be demonstrated. The truth is, the papists put the same scorn upon the Scriptures, that the Prophet *Elisha* did upon that ungodly King *Jehoram*, 2 *Kings* 3,14. and bespeak it in the same language, *were it not that I regard the presence*, the testimony and the authority of the Church, *I would not look towards thee, nor believe nor reverence thee.*

Sect. 3. If it be said, that although the Churches Testimony was necessary before, yet since the Church hath long agoe consigned the Canon of the Scripture, my faith is now grounded not onely upon the Churches Testimony, but upon the Scriptures Authority.

To this I answer, 1. That now as well as formerly, the Faith of a Christian (acted by Romish principles) doth not depend upon the Word, but barely upon the Churches testimony, which I shall make plain by an instance. I do not believe (supposing I were a Papist) the Popes supremacy, because I read these words, *Thou art Peter*; for if I read these words in *Tacitus*, I should not draw an Argument from them, unless happily I should fall into as merry a vein as *Bellarmine* doth, when he proves Purgatory out of (b) *Plato*, *Cicero*, and *Virgil*.

(a) *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesiæ commoveret authoritas.* (b) *Bell. de Purgat. lib.* 1. *cap.* 7.

but because the books wherein I read those words, *Thou art Peter*, is a book of Canonical Scripture, and a part of the word of God, there lies the whole stresse of the argument. And this I cannot know, (say our Catholick masters,) and am not bound to believe, but for the Churches Testimony: which Testimony, as it is the onely cause which makes the Scripture in general Authentical *quoad nos*, saith *Stapleton*, so it must be *that* alone, which makes this place *Thou art Peter*, Argumentative *quoad nos*, that is, all the force that Argument hath to perswade or convince me, is from the Church, and not from the Scripture, and the Scripture makes it Canonical to me, and its being Canonical, gives the whole weight to the Argument, and *quod est causa causæ est causa causati.*

Sect. 4. 2. It is not the Words, but Sence of Scripture where the strength of the Argument lies. And that sence, say they, we cannot understand, nor attain, but by the Churches interpretation, which leads me to the second principle of the Romanists, viz. That the sence of Scripture (which indeed is the very Soul of Scripture, and the onely Ground of Faith, and Arguments) is in many matters of Faith so obscure and ambiguous, that there is an absolute necessity of an Authentick and infallible Interpreter and Judge, to acquaint us therewith, that is, the Church, or (*per equivalentiam Jesuiticam*) the Pope. And it is absurd to expect, and impossible to receive satisfaction of doubts, and decision of controversies of Faith from the Scripture, which is but a dead letter, unless the Church animates it. This is so notoriously owned by them all, that it is needless to quote Authors for it, That which I inferre from hence is this, that according to this Hypothesis, the Scripture in it self, (I say *in it self*), for that is all the present Proposition pretends to prove) is no solid foundation for my faith; and indeed, that it is a meer Cypher, which if the Church be

be put to it may have some signification and value, but else none at all. And this is not the letter of the Scripture in it selfe, but the Churches interpretation, which gives weight to this Argument. And this plainly appeares from that saying of their great Mr. *Stapleton*, which deserves to be often mentioned *in rei memoriam*, and the rather, because *Gretserus* owns it and justifies it. When *Stapleton* had asserted in his triplication against *Whitaker*, c. 17. that even *the Divinity of Christ, and of God did depend upon the Authority of the Pope*; and when *Pappus* had charged *Stapleton* with that assertion, *Gretser's* defence is, *that* Stapleton *did not mean that they depended upon the* Pope in se & ex parte rei, *but onely* quoad nos, *in respect of us*, *and so* saith Gretser, *it is very true, for I that believe that Christ is God, & that God is one, & three, I do it, being induced by the Authority of the Church, testifying that those books wherein such things are delivered, are divine & dictated by God.* (b) I desire the Reader to observe this, as fully opening the mystery of the Romish *Cabal*, and discovering the dreadful tendency of Popish principles, making the Divinity of Christ precarious, that the Divinity of the Pope may be absolute and certain. And thus I trow the Pope hath quit scores with Christ, for as he was beholden to Christ for his Authority, so now Christ is beholden to his Vicar for his Divinity: and, saith he, *it was truly said by* Tannerus, (*nor needed* Pappus *to wonder at it,*) *that without the interpreta-*

(a) Defens. Bel. Tom. 1. pag. 386. (b) *Recte hoc ab illo asseritur. Addit enim* Stapletonus, *divinitatem Christi & Dei pendere à testimonio & judiciaria potestate Pontificis* quoad nos, *non in se & ex parte rei.* Et paulò pòst: *Neque prædicanti adeò mirum videri debet, quod à* Tannero *nostro in examine Relationis Hunniquæ scriptum est, sine hac interpretatione & testificatione Ecclesiæ impossibile fore credere (supernaturaliter) ex sola scriptura, Deum esse unum, tres esse hypostases divinas in una essentia: non est, inquam, quòd adeò miretur & irascatur insulsus* Pappus, *quia nihil à veritate alienum complectitur.* Defens. Bel. Tom. 1. in Append. 1. ad lib. 1. Card. Bel. p. 386.

tion and teſtification of the Church it is impoſſible to believe out of Scripture alone, that God is one, and that there are three perſons. Who is it that dare charge theſe Jeſuites with Equivocation? I think they ſpeak as plainly as their greateſt enemies can deſire. Here you ſee the meaning of that diſtinction *quoad ſe & quoad nos*, viz. they acknowledge the Scripture in it ſelf to be true and Canonical, and it is a truth in it ſelf, that Chriſt is God; but ſo far as concerns me, I am not bound to believe either one or the other, but for the Churches teſtimony, which is the very thing I am now proving & hereby granted, that the Scripture in it ſelf is no foundation of my Faith. And this is the more weighty, becauſe you ſee it was not an unadviſed ſlip of one man's pen, but here you have it deliberately aſſerted & defended by a Triumvirate of popiſh Authors, each of whoſe works, where that paſſage was, is ſet forth with the approbation of ſeveral Romiſh Doctors of principal note.

§. 5. But peradventure, *quæ non proſunt ſingula juncta juvant.* Although neither the Pope's Authority, nor the Scriptures Teſtimony alone will, yet both together may conſtitute a ſolid and ſufficient foundation of Faith; and the Popes Authority being aſſerted in, and demonſtrated by the Scriptures, is a ſure footing for my Faith. To which, though it might ſuffice to object the Circle, (which is here moſt palpable and evident,) yet I ſhall at preſent forbear that anſwer, and referre it to another place, and ſhall here conſider, whether the Scriptures aſſert the Pope's infallible authority, as it is pretended. And firſt in general, whereas ſeveral Texts of Scripture are pleaded by the Romaniſts, in favour of the Pope's ſupremacy and infallibility, as *Feed my ſheep*,—*Thou art* Peter, *I have prayed for thee*,— and the like: I demand whether theſe words or Texts of Scripture, in, and for themſelves, without the interpretation and teſtification of the Romiſh Church, do bind me to believe the Pope's ſupremacy

premacy, and infallibility, or not: If they deny the validity of these Texts, without the Churches Testimony and Authority (as needs they must according to their principles) then it follows, that there is nothing in Scripture, considered in it self, that binds me to believe the Popes supremacy, and consequently I do not sin, when I do not believe & own their arguments drawn from these Texts, and that the Scripture in it self is no sufficient Foundation for a Papists Faith. If they affirm it, then let all the Papists in the world give me a reason why these Texts, *The word was God*, Joh. 1. *He thought it no robbery to be equal with God*, Phil. 2. *This is the true God.*— 1 Joh. 5. should not in themselves, and without the Churches Authority as solidly prove the Divinity of Christ, as the other mentioned Texts are affirmed to prove the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope.

§. 6. If they persist still to say, that the alleadged Texts are in themselves a solid Foundation for my Faith, although such an assertion is contrary to their universal profession, and overturnes the whole Fabrick of Popery; yet because I know these *Protean's* will turn themselves into all shapes, and endeavour to slip all knots, and because I observe all their writings are stuffed with several Texts of Scripture, as if they should make their deluded Proselites believe they made them the Foundation of their Faith: I shall therefore make some brief remarks upon the chief of their Scripture allegations, in pursuance of the Proposition under consideration, and shew that the Faith of a Papist hath no foundation at all in the sacred Scripture, in the great and fundamental point of the Pope's infallibility. Onely that you may understand the diffidence, which some of their own great Rabbies have in their Scripture Arguments, I shall mind you of a remarkable saying of an eminent Doctor, *Pighius*, who perswading his Catholicks in their disputations, rather to

argue from Tradition then Scriptures, he breaks out into these memorable expressions; (a) *Of which Doctrine if we had been mindful, that Hereticks are not to be convinced out of Scriptures, our affaires had been in a better posture, but whilst for ostentation of wit and learning, men disputed with* Luther *from Scripture, this Fire, which, alas, we now see was kindled.* As if he had said, You may as soon fetch water out of a stone, as prove the Romish cause from the Scripture. Oh the power of Truth! Oh the Desperateness of the popish cause. His counsel indeed was good but they could not follow it; for having once been fumbling about some Scriptures, though they saw well enough how impertinent they were to their purpose, yet having once begun, they were obliged to proceed, and make good their attempts, (for of all things in the world they hate retreating and recanting) least they should put an Argument into our hands, against the infallibility of the Church from her actual mistakes and errours in the expositions of Scriptures.

Sect. 7. The principal places of Scripture upon which the Popes supreme Authority and infallibility is founded, are as follow.

The first is Matth. 16. 18. *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevaile against it: Ergo,* the Pope is supreme Head, and infallible. I shall forbear *actum agere,* and therefore shall omit several Answers already given, and onely point at some few of those many allegations, by which the ridiculousnesse of this collection may appear, and

(a) *Cujus doctrinæ, si memores fuissemus, hæreticos non esse informandos seu convincendos ex Scripturis, meliore sanè loco essent res nostræ, sed, dum ostentandi ingenii & eruditionis gratiâ cum* Luthero *in certamen descenditur Scripturarum, excitatum est hoc, quod, proh dolor! videmus incendium.* cap. 4. Hierarchiæ,

the

the desperateneſſe of that cauſe that can find no better ſupports.

1. This promiſe concernes onely the inviſible Church of elect perſons, which appears thus, becauſe he ſpeaks of that Church, againſt which the gates of Hell do not prevaile, but the gates of Hell do prevaile againſt all reprobates (and therefore the meaneſt ſincere elect Chriſtian in the World, hath a juſter claime to infallibility from this place, than many *Popes* of *Rome* had, whom their own Authors confeſſe to have been Reprobates.)

2. This promiſe ſecures the Church as well from damnable ſins as damnable errours. I prove it; The Church is here ſecured againſt the prevalency of the Gates of Hell: But the gates of Hell may prevaile as ſurely, and doe prevaile as frequently by damnable ſins, as by errors. *Ergo*, if therefore notwithſtanding this Text, Popes have fallen into damnable Sins, they may conſequently fall into damnable Hereſies.

3. The infallibility here promiſed, extends onely to damnable Hereſies, and ſuch as lead to, and leave a man under the gates of Hell, and therefore if it were intended of the Pope and Church of *Rome*, Chriſt promiſeth no more infallibility to him, then he hereby promiſeth, and generally giveth to all perſevering Chriſtians.

4. This promiſe is ſpoken of, and made to the whole Church, and therefore belongs to all the parts and members of it alike. So that if it prove the infallibility of the Romiſh Biſhop and Church, it proves alſo the ſame of the Biſhops and Churches of *Corinth*, *Epheſus*, *Philippi*, *&c.* which may further appear thus. That if we ſhould grant the Papiſts their abſurd ſuppoſition, that this Rock was not *Peter's* Confeſſion but his Perſon, yet ſince the Biſhops of *Corinth* and *Epheſus*, and indeed all the Biſhops in the World, according to this ſuppoſition were built upon *Peters* perſon, as well as the Biſhop of *Rome*,

and the infallibility supposed is here promised equally to all that are built upon the Rock, it must either prove all of them infallible, or leave the Pope fallible.

5. Whatsoever Authority or Infallibility is here promised to *Peter*, is in other places promised and given to the rest of the Apostles, and therefore what is collected from this place for St *Peters* successors, may be with equal truth and evidence pleaded from other places, for the successours of the rest of the Apostles. The same Keyes which are here promised to *Peter* are actually given to all the Apostles, *Matth.* 18. 18. and *Joh.* 20. 22, 23. And if infallibility be here promised to *Peter*, as much is promised to all the Apostles, *John* 16. 13. *He will guide you in all truth.* And if St *Peter* be here called a Rock, so are the other Apostles called Pillars, *Gal.* 2. 9. and Foundations, *Ephes.* 2. *Apocal.* 21. 24. And that 16th of *Mathew* speaks not one syllable more of transmitting St *Peters* Authority to his successors, than those other places do to their successors: and therefore it unavoidably followes, either that all their Successours are infallible, or that St *Peters* successour is fallible, at least for any thing that appears from this Text: whether the popes infallibility hath other foundations we shall examine in their order.

§ 8. It may be said, that although this place may not seem to be cogent to one that considers it in it self, yet if you take it according to the exposition of the Fathers, it proves what it is alleadged for.

But 1. The Fathers generally did understand this Rock to be not *Peters* person, but his confession, or Christ as confessed by him; and this you shall find proved to have been the mind of S. *Cyril*, *Hilary*, *Hierom*, *Ambrose*, *Basil*, *Augustine*, yea and the whole Councel of *Chalcedon* in that incomparably learned and irrefragable discourse of *Moulins*, called *The Novelty of Popery*, Lib. 2. cap. 4.

2 That

2. That the Fathers are not infallible guides of Faith and Religion I shall prove in the next Proposition.

3. But howsoever, They that assert the infallibility of the Fathers, when they relate the Churches Judgment, yet allow their Fallibility in expounding Scripture. *Cajetan*, and *Maldonate* both acknowledge it, and practise accordingly, that a man may in many cases preferre a new Exposition, though it be repugnant to the expositions of most of the Ancient Fathers. And Sr *Kenelme Digby* speaking of the infallibility of the Fathers, expressly saith he understands it onely *of the Tradition, or Doctrines, delivered by them as the Faith received from their Ancestors, not of their Comments or Sermons upon Scripture, which are to have no more weight then the Reasons they give for them.* Letters between Lord *Digby* and S. *Kenelme Digby*, pag. 10.

§. 9. But if all these, and other difficulties were cleared, yet do two things remaine behind, in which this Text, and all others are wholly silent, and for them they are forced to fly to Tradition, and the Authority of the Fathers, (of which in the next place.) The first, That all this supreme Authority and Infallibility, which they suppose to have been in *Peter*, was transmitted to his Successor, (and consequently *Linus* S. *Peters* Successor was superior to the Apostle and Evangelist St. *John*, which he had need have no squeamish Conscience that can digest) and yet all this amounts to nothing, unlesse another thing be proved, *viz.* That the Bishop of *Rome* is St. *Peters* successor; and here the Scripture failes them, and the Coronis or Apex of the Argument (without which it is both impertinent and impotent as to the probation of the Soveraignty of the Roman Bishop) is fetched solely from Tradition and the Testimony of the Fathers: And so their Argument stands like the Angel in the Apocalypse, with one foot on the Earth, another on the Sea

Sea, one Leg of it in Scripture, the other in History; and because *conclusio sequitur partem deteriorem*, the conclusion cannot be *de fide*, or rather, to speak the truth, the whole Syllogisme is *extra-Scriptural*. The prerogatives of St. *Peter* are transmitted to St *Peter's* Successors; but the Bishop of *Rome* is St *Peters* successor: where it appeares from what hath been said, that neither proposition is to be proved from Scripture, but wholly from Tradition, and that is all at present I am concerned to make good. And yet if all this were over, they have not done. Behold the misery of a desperate cause: for whereas it is knowne, and granted by the Papists, that St *Peter* had two See's, he was Bishop of *Antioch* for seaven yeares saith *Baronius*, and Bishop of *Rome*; it must be further evinced, that the Bishop of *Antioch* was excluded from, and the Bishop of *Rome* invested with St *Peters* prerogatives. And would you know the proof of this position (which is the very foundation-stone of the Pope's supremacy. You shall have the Argument in *Bellarmine's* words, "*It had its rise à facto Petri, from St.* Peter's *fact*. Peter *leaves* Antioch *and comes to* Rome, *and there he dies*, and so his Holinesse got the day. Here I desire the Reader to observe, that all the Faith of the Romanists concerning the Pope's infallibility, depends upon, and is resolved into a matter of Fact, and an uncertain Historical Relation. Nay, to speak truely, there are several matters of Fact, every one of which must be solidly demonstrated, before their Faith can have a firme Foundation. 1. That *Peter* was at *Rome*. 2. That *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome* properly so called. 3. That St *Peter* died at *Rome*. 4. That it was Christ's, or Peter's intention, that *Peter's* Successor should enjoy all his Priviledges. 5. That Christ or *Peter* appointed his *Roman*, not his *Antiochian* successor to

(o) *De Pontificiis*. Lib. 4.

be

be this person to whom such priviledges were to be transmitted. If there be a flaw in any one of these, their whole cause in this point is lost. And all these are matters of act. And such is the nature, and uncertainty of matters of fact, that the Papists confesse those persons whom they suppose infallible in matters of Faith, are fallible in matters of Fact. Excepting that moderne dotage of some of the Jesuites, who have lately asserted the Popes infallibility in matters of Fact: but that is such a piece of Drollery and impudence, that their own brethren, who have not forsworne all modesty are ashamed of it: now to assume, as some of these assertions are apparently false, so there are none of them, but are disputable points, and denyed by divers learned men, not without a plausible appearance of Authorities and Arguments. And if the Jesuites opinion be true concerning the doctrine of probability, that a man may satisfie his conscience, and venture his salvation upon the opinions of two or three learned Doctors, then a Protestant may satisfie his conscience & venture his salvation upon it, that all these propositions are false; being denied by far more than that number of learned Doctors At least this must be granted, that it renders the forementioned positions dubious and uncertain: and so the Papists build their divine faith upon a dubious historical Faith. Yet again: what if *Peter* dies there? must the universal Headship needs go to the Bishop of the place where he dies, and not to another where he lived? *Charles* the fifth was King of *Spain*, and Emperour of *Germany*; if he die in *Spain*, must all the Kings of *Spain* be therefore Emperours of *Germany*? Haply they will say, no, because the Empire is elective, not hereditary. And if that were granted, which the Papist will never be able to prove, that there were such a thing as this universal headship, and that this was to continue, will they pawn their soules on it, (for so indeed they do) that this univer-

universal headship was hereditary, not elective? How will they prove it? Christ dies at *Jerusalem*, by this rule the Bishop of *Jerusalem* must be universal Head. Suppose the Pope should leave *Rome*, and go to *Avignon*, (as once he did) and settle, and die there, by this rule the Bishop of *Avignon* must succeed in the universal headship. But I need say no more of so absurd a fancy.

Sect. 10. A second place of Scripture is *Joh.* 21. *Peter feed my Sheep.* And this feeding must denote ruling as well as teaching, and this Rule (forsooth) must needs be the supreme power, and that power must be attended with Infallibility, and these sheep must be all the sheep in the world, nay, sheepheards too, except the *Pan*, or *princeps pastorum* at *Rome*. *Tanta molis erat Romanum condere Papam.* And this Rope of Sand must be called an Argument, by which one may see the intolerable confidence they have in themselves, and their shameless contempt of the Readers, whom they think obliged to receive all their dictates without enquiry. I would have you to wit, that the Church of *Rome* knew what they did, when they invented the doctrine of an implicite Faith, and a blind obedience to all the Churches Decrees, for if men should once dare to open their Eyes and examine their Assertions, all their Craft would be in danger to be set at nought, and the temple of *Dominus Deus noster papa* (as the Canon Law calls him) would be despised, and his magnificence would be destroyed, whom so great part of the world worshippeth. But if indeed they will by Transubstantiation turn this handfull of straw into a pillar of their Church (as I cannot blame one neer drowning, for catching at every twig) then I shall offer these things to their consideration.

1. That *Bellarmine* (as his manner is) bestowes seven Arguments to prove that which none ever denied, That those words were spoken to *Peter* alone, and neglects that

that which he should have disproved *viz.* the reason thereof given by *Aug. Cyril, Ambrose,* and others, and after them the Protestants, which was, not the collation of a new dignity superior to that of the other Apostles, but his restauration to his former dignity of the Apostleship, from which by his great transgression, he might seem to have fallen, as *Judas* really did fall by his transgression, *Act.* 1.

2. If this Text afford them any support, they must have it either from the *Act*, or the word *Feed*, or from the object or phrase, *my sheep*. For the first, By what Arts can the Supremacy of the Pope be drawn from that word or precept? This feeding (in the judgment of the Romanists themselves) implies nothing but teaching and ruling, and both those are ascribed to all the Apostles without any discrimination, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Mat.* 18. *John* 20. And *Bellarmine* himself confesseth, *that not onely the power of Rule, but the supreme power was conferred upon all the Apostles.* (a) Nay, they are ascribed to inferiour Ministers, *Heb.* 13. *Obey them that have the Rule over you:* and 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *The Elders that rule well:* and to such the very same precept is given, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. 2. The *Elders--I exhort--Feed the flock of God which is among you.* Doth *feeding* in one place argue Superiority, and in another place imply subjection? or rather in both places it seems it signifies what the Pope pleaseth. But you must know the Romish Doctors having called the Scripture a *Lesbian* Rule, and a Nose of Wax,— they were bound in honour *aut invenire aut facere*, either to find it so, or to make it such: if it be said their charge is limited to the Flock of God among them; whereas *Peters* extends to all the sheep; the Answer is easie, if that be granted, for then the difference doth not lie in the

(a) *Lib. de Pontifice Romano, lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. §. *Ut autem.*

act

act of Feeding, but in the object, of which I now come to speak, that is the second thing; the phrase, *my sheep.*

Granting therefore what *Bellar.* desires, that he speaks of all the sheep, yet herein St. *Peter* had no prerogative above the other Apostles, who are equally commanded to teach and baptise all Nations, *Mat.* 26. 19. to preach the Gospel to every creature, *Mar.* 16. 15. And *Peter's* Dioces surely cannot be larger, unless happily *Utopia* be taken in, or that which is in the same part of the world, I meane Purgatory. But you will say, surely they have somewhat else to plead for themselves from this Text; why yes, These good Masters of the Feast have reserved the best Wine to the last. Here comes in a rare notion, not fit to be prostituted to vulgar apprehensions, you shall hear it, upon condition you will not put them to the proose of it, which they are not bound to doe, for *nemo tenetur ad impossibilia, No man is obliged to do more than is in his power:* *Peter* was to feed the sheep as ordinary pastours, the rest as extraordinary Ambassadors, and with a certain subjection to *Peter.* (*a*) If you aske, doth this Text say so? or any other Text? or is there one syllable from whence this may be deduced? you must remember the condition which I told you. And what if this be granted, how comes the ordinary power to be greater and higher than the extraordinary? In the old Testament generally, the extraordinary officers, the Prophets whom God raised were superiour to the Priests: And in the New Testament, the Apostles and Evangelists who were extraordinary officers, were superior to Pastors and Teachers, which are the ordinary. How come the

(a) *Ut autem intelligeremus hanc summam potestatem collatam Apostolis omnibus, ut legatis, non ut pastoribus ordinariis & cum quadam subjectione ad* Petrum. Bel. de Romano Pontifice lib. 1, cap. 12.

Tables

Tables to be turned? and the ordinary agent to be advanced above the extraordinary Ambassadours? And what if all this be granted, it signifies nothing, unless two things be superadded? of both which the Scripture is wholly silent, and their proofs fail them. 1. They must prove that this power of feeding is transmitted to *Peters* Successors in a more peculiar manner, than to the Successors of the other Apostles, and that whatever power *Peter* had is deposited in their hand, 2. That the Pope is this Successor, to whom these things are concredited. And these they do not pretend to proue from Scripture: So that still the Conclusion remaines entire, That the Scripture is not to the Papists a solid and sure ground of Faith.

§. 11. A third place alwayes in their mouthes, *Luke* 22. 31. *Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to winnow You; but I have prayed that thy Faith faile not.* A man would not believe, if he did not see it with his own Eyes that such Learned men as diverse of the Papists are, should put any confidence in such broken Reeds and shatter'd Arguments as this is Truly, saith a Learned man, *Hoc non est disputare, sed somniare*: this is rather a Dreame, than an Argument. What thoughts the Papists have of our English Sectaries is sufficiently known, but I must needs do them this right to professe, I do not know that Sect among us (the Quakers excepted) so absurd and impertinent in the allegations of Scripture for their most irrational opinions, as in sundry particulars (and this especially) the Papists are. But because they shall not complain of us (as we do justly of them) that we rather condemn them than confute them, I shall shew the ridiculousnesse of this allegation to their purpose.

1. If this prayer secure the Pope from unbelief, and errour in judgment, it secures him also from unbelieſe and Apostacy in heart and life: but this prayer doth not

not secure the Pope from Apostacy in heart and life? The Papists generally confesse, that several of their Popes were *Apostatici, non Apostolici*, Apostates, not Apostolick persons. All the doubt lies about the Major, which I prove thus: If this prayer was put up for *Peter* in the name and on the behalfe of his Successours as well as himselfe (as the Papists pretend it was, though we deny it) then the same thing for which Christ prayes for *Peter*, Christ prayes for it for his Successors also, and therefore if Christ prayed that *Peter* might be kept from Apostacy in heart and life as well as in opinion and judgment, then the Major is true; but Christ prayed that *Peter* might be so kept, which I thus prove. Christ's prayer was the Antidote against the Devils malicious designe, *Satan hath desired to winnow you, but I have prayed* &c. And consequently the plaister must be as large as the Sore: but the Devils designe was not onely to draw *Peter* to error in judgment, but also, yea principally to draw him to Apostacy in heart and life. *Ergo*

2 If notwithwanding this prayer it was possible, that *Peter* himself might fall so farre after Christ's prayer, as to teach a false Doctrine, then this prayer doth not prove the Popes Infallibility. But notwithstanding this prayer, it was possible that *Peter* might fall so farre as to teach a false doctrine. The Minor, which alone needs proof, I prove thus. He that believed a false Doctrine, might preach a false doctrine; but *Peter* after this prayer did believe a false doctrine, which plainly appears from *Act.* 1. 6. *Wilt thou at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel?* by which it is evident (and the popish Expositors confess it) that the Apostles (& *Peter* with them) still retained the old Leaven, of the belief of a Temporal Monarchy of Christ upon earth, (a doctrine which the Papists themselves condemn in the Millenaries.) Nor was this the onely mistake of *Peter* or the Apostles after that Prayer. And indeed

it

it was not Christ's prayer but the gift of the Holy Ghost after his death, which did secure the Apostles from error, and us from deceit, in following their Doctrines.

3. If Christs prayer, for the not failing of *Peters* Faith, render the Pope infallible, then St. *Pauls* prayer for the Thessalonians, *I pray God your whole Spirit, Soul and Body be preserved blameless unto the comming of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 *Thes.* 5. 23. and for the Philippians, *That they might abound in knowledg, ——and approve things that are excellent, that they might be sincere, and without offence, till the day of Christ*, Philip. 1. 9. proves the infallibility, yea the impeccability of the Thessalonians, and the Philippians. The reason is this: because St. *Paul's* prayer being infallibly dictated by God's spirit, and made according to his word, and in Christs name, must as surely be answered, as Christs prayer was; for God, who cannot lie, hath promised to answer such prayers.

4. If the prayer of Christ for the perseverance of Faith, makes him infallible for whom Christ prayes, then all elect and persevering Believers are infallible. The Consequence appears thus, Because Christ did pray, and doth intercede for the perseverance of the Faith of every such person. Christ expresly tels us, Joh. 17. *I pray not for these alone, but for them also which shall believe in me through their word.* And there is not one persevering Christian in the World, but owes his perseverance to the prayer, care, and intercession of Christ: Hence they are said to be preserved in Christ Jesus, *Jud.* 1. 1. And therefore either this Argument concludes not for the Popes infallibility, or else it gives him ten thousand partners in that priviledge. And surely, if the prayer for this mercy makes the Pope infallible, much more doth the actual donation of this mercy make believers infallible.

5. This prayer was intended for the other Apostles, as well as *Peter* (though Christ speak to *Peter* in the name

of the rest, as his manner was, as evidently appears from hence. Christ prayes for those whom the Devil desires to winnow: That is plain from the words, *Satan hath desired to winnow you, but I have prayed*— But the Devils aim was, not onely against *Peter*, but the rest of the Apostles, as Christ expressly tels us, Ἐξῃτήσατο, not *σε thee*, but *ὑμᾶς you*, in the plural number. And therefore it followes, that as the disease and danger was general and common to all the Apostles, so was that relief and succour, which Christ here afforded, and consequently all the Apostles are interested in this promise, and therefore either it makes not the Successors of *Peter* infallible, or else it makes all the successors of all the Apostles infallible, let them choose which they will.

6. And yet, if all those difficulties be overcome, the Conclusion may be granted, without any advantage to their cause. For what if Christ prayed for *Peter* alone? What if this prayer intended and procured infallibility for him? *Quid hoc ad Iphicli boves?* What is this to the Pope? What Scripture, what Father, what man (that is not wholly mancipated to the Popes ambitious humour) will say or can prove that the Pope is interested in all the prayers of Christ for *Peter*? Or why may not all the Successors of the other Apostles upon as good grounds claime an interest in that prayer of Christ for the infallibility of all the Apostles, *Joh.* 17. (For sure I am those prayers of Christ, that God would *keep them through his own name*. v. 11. *keep them from evil*, v. 15. *sanctifie them through his truth and keep them unto glory*, v. 21, 22, 23, 24. do as fully imply infallibility, as this, that *Peter's* Faith might not faile.) Or if I do grant, what they cannot prove, that *Peter's* successors have this as their peculiar, yet why should not this prayer preserve the Chair of *Antioch*, as well as that of *Rome*, from Fallibility? And how can this prayer, *that his Faith may not faile*, be

put

put up by Christ for one of them that he tels us, he doth not pray for. *Joh.* 17. 9. *I pray not for the world*, i. e. of reprobates, (and such many Popes are confessed to have been) or how can this prayer for perseverance in the faith be offered up by Christ, for such as never had any true faith (as is acknowledged of many Popes) or how dare they say Christ prayed thus for the faith of all succeeding Popes, when they confesse the Faith of several Popes haith failed? it is true they have a miserable shift, they tell us a *Pope may erre as a private person, though not as a Pope, he may erre personally, though not judicially*, not *in Cathedrâ*: *It is no doubt among us* (saith *Costerus*) (a) *That the Pope as a private person may erre, and fall into Heresie.* If this bē granted, the Pope is concerned in this prayer and promise of Infallibility. For if this prayer for *Peter* reacheth to his Successors, then the same priviledge for which Christ here prayes for *Peter*, for the same he prayeth for his Successors: but the same priviledge, which according to their supposition is here prayed for on *Peters* behalf, is not prayed for on the behalf of his Successors, themselves being Judges. For Christ's prayer they confesse secured *Peter* from falling into error, even as a private person, which you see they do not pretend for the Pope. But here is the benefit of the Popes reserving the key of interpretations in his own breast, for now he can order it as he pleaseth, and proportion the meanings of any Text as need requires, and so this Text (if you please to believe them) it procures 1. That *Peter* cannot erre, neither personally, nor judicially. 2. That the Pope may erre personally, but not

(a) *Dico nullum apud nos dubium esse, Romanum Pontificem ut hominem privatum, errare, ac in hæresin labi posse. in Apologia c. 2.*

judicially. 3. That the whole Church of *Rome* cannot erre personally: But it is all the reason in the world that the first inventers and Authors of Infallibility should have the disposing of it in their own hands.

§. 12. A fourth place vehemently urged on the behalf of the Popes infallibity, is *Deut.* 17. 11, 12. where the *Jewes are commanded under pain of death to stand to the judgment of the High-priest, and to do according to the sentence which the Priest should shew them.* Therefore (say they) the High priest was infallible (else the people had been bound to rest in a false decision) & consequently the Pope, who succeeds in the High-priests place, is infallible.

To which I answer, 1. If a man should put them to prove the consequence, how wofully would they be gravelled? If these Romanists would lay aside their Dictatorship, and condescend to the proof of their Assertion, how would they prove one of these things: 1 that the high Priest of the Jewes hath a visible Successor upon Earth among Christians. 2. That the Pope alone is this Successor. 3. That this supposed Successor must be invested with all the priviledges which the High-priest had. But I shall passe by all these, and the horrible impertinency of the instance, & the feebleness of the consequence, & shall assault them on the strongest side by denying the Antecedent *viz.* that any infallibility is here ascribed or promised to the High-priest: for proof hereof I offer these Arguments.

1. No more infallibility is here ascribed to the High-priest, than to the Iudge and to the inferiour Priests. But the Judge and inferiour Priests were not infallible. *Ergo* this place doth not prove the High-priests infallibility. The *Major* is evident from the reading of the Words: the Judge or Civil Magistrate is joyned in the same commission with the Priest, and the people are commanded to acquiesce indifferently in the determinations both of the one and of the other: and therefore either

thes both are infallible, or neither. Again, it is not the high-priest alone, who is here meant, but others also, To the words run in the plural number, *The Priests, the Levites, v. 9. and they shall shew thee*, they shall inform thee.

For the *Minor* it is acknowledged by the Papists, *Ergo*,

2. If this text proves the High-priests infallibility, it proves it in the matter here spoken of: but this place doth not prove the High-priests infallibility, in the matters here spoken of: for those are matters of Fact, *between bloud and bloud, plea and plea, stroke and stroke*: questions which were decided by testimonies, and in such they confesse the Pope may erre. So then their Argument runs thus: The High-priest was infallible in matters of Fact, therefore the Pope is not infallible in matters of Fact, but he is infallible in matters of Faith: but our comfort is, as it is a dangerous Argument, so themselves furnish us with an Antidote; for they deny both Propositions. 1. They deny the consequent, from matters of Fact, to matters of Faith. 2. They deny the antecedent, for they do not ascribe to the Pope, and consequently not to the High-priest, infallibility in matters of Fact. You see what shifts they are put to, to support their cause with such rotten posts: to argue from the Authority of the Priests, to end particular controversies between man and man, between bloud and bloud, plea and plea, stroke and stroke, (which is all that place speaks of) to the infallibility of the Pope, in all the matters of God, and deciding all the controversies of Religion, I think they have sufficiently improved the stock the High-priest left them.

3. Those words (however they may seem to a careless reader at first view) do not assert the infallibility of the priest or priests, nor the obligation of the people to an absolute submission and blind obedience to all their dictates and expositions, and that for two undeniable reasons.

1. Because other places of Scripture (with whom this

must be reconciled) command both Prince and people to keep close to the word of God, and to that end, to read in the book of the Law diligently, and to do according to all that is written therein, *Deut.* 5.32, 33. *You shall observe to do as the Lord hath commanded you, you shall not turn aside to the right hand, or to the left: You shall walk in all the wayes which the Lord commanded you.* So *Deut.* 6.6, *&c.* It is God's speech to *Joshuah, ch.* 1.8. *This book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein.* And in case of doubt, it is the Prophet's injunction to the people to have recourse to the Law, and to the Testimony, *Isa.* 8.20. Now put case an high Priest should fall into idolatry (I may well suppose it, for it was done) and should expound the Law so as to favour his opinion & practice, I demand whether in this case, the people of the Jews were bound to believe and obey him, or not, to worship an Idol, or not? Affirme it none will, but one of a Jesuitical *h.e.* a seared conscience, nor can any Christian hear such an assertion without horror, if they deny it, their argument from this place is lost.

2. That sence of Scripture which justifies the Jewes in putting Christ to death, is a false sence, and corrupt exposition: but the popish sence of this place, and their argument from it, doth justifie the Jewes in putting Christ to death, *Ergo* it is a corrupt exposition: for the *Major*, be that denies it, deserves not the name of a Christian, and whatever his successors will do at a pinch, I am sure St. *Peter* did not justifie them, but severely condemnes them, and highly aggravates their sin in it: *Act.* 2, *&* 3 *&* 4, *&* 5. The *Minor* (about which alone the doubt lies) I shall easily prove: which I am more willing to do, that all Christians may observe the just judgment of God, and the fearful Apostacy of these men, that, rather than recant their errours, will (in effect) renounce Christianity

stianity, and justifie the murderers of Christ; I prove it thus. If the Jewes, in that act, did nothing, but what by virtue of this place they were obliged to do; then they did not sin: but the Jewes did nothing in the murdering of Christ, but what by virtue of this place (if the popish sence be true), they were obliged to doe. *Ergo.* The *Major* they do, and must grant, for it cannot be a sin to obey God's command. The *Minor* I prove: if this law did require absolute obedience to their Priests, and was in force at that time, then the Jewes did nothing but what they were obliged to do: But this Law did require such obedience (say the Papists) & it was in force at that time, say I, *Ergo.* The consequence no man will deny, but he that doth not understand it: The *Minor* I prove it in its two branches. 1. This Law bound the Jewes to absolute obedience to their Priests: This is known to be their opinion. But because I have no great confidence in the ingenuity of these men, I will prove it out of 2 or 3 of their most eminent Authors. *Becanus* hath these words, *the whole people in matters of Religion were commanded to follow that which the High-priest enjoyned them.* (a) What more plain? Thus *Melchior Canus* (one of great Authority with them) *Moses doth not command that they should believe the Priests, if they judged according to Law, but rather, that they should take that for Law, which the Priest taught them.* (b) *Bellar.* disputes against the assertion of *Brentius, That the people were to stand to the judgment of the High-priests onely, upon condition they judged according to Law,* and argues that they were absolutely bound to follow it. (c) And (that you may see it is

(a) *Totus Populus in negotio religionis jubebatur id sequi, quod Pontifex judicabat sequi oportere. In manuali de Judice controversiarum lib. 1. cap. 5. nu. 62.* (b) *Non præcipit* Moses *ut sacerdotibus credant, si judicarent secundùm legem, sed potius, ut quæ sacerdotes docuerint, ea pro lege habeantur in oper. Cani, l. 6. c. 10.* (c) *De verbi Dei interp. l. 3. c. 4.*

a resolved case) *Gretser* defends *Bell.* in it, and tels us plainly, *the people were bound to stand to the High-priests judgment, whatsoever their sentence was*(a). I think an Adversary will not require more for the proof of the first branch of the *Minor*.

The second branch of the *Minor* is, that this Law was then in force, which I prove thus. If Christ had not at that time destroyed or abolished this Law, it was in force: but Christ had not at that time destroyed or abolished it. The Ceremonial Law which was to expire, yet in the judgment of all intelligent Divines, Antient and Modern, popish and protestant, did not expire till the death of Christ, and consequently while Christ lived this Law was in force, which being considered, quite invalidates the last and most plausible evasion of the Papists to this instance, as *Becanus* delivers it, *Synagoga ferè expiravit The Synagogue was almost expired*: He should have said the *precept* Deut. 17. *was altogether expired*, and in stead of it here is, *the Synagogue was almost expired*: and what then? it was not yet expired, nor dead. A man that is almost dead is yet alive, and while the Law lives, it hath its force over us, as the Apostle argues *Rom.* 7. 1. else it is a pretty device of *Becanus*, & will do fine feats; for by the same argument I will prove that the Jews were not *then* bound to observe their Passeover, *quia Synagoga ferè expiravit*. And if that Law which enjoyned the observation of the Passeover was in full force to the Jewes, notwithstanding the nearnesse of its expiration, then the same must be acknowledged of this Law, which required absolute obedience to the high-priests sentence, & consequently the Jews were then bound by it, and therefore (*correfcoreferens*) did not sin in it. And because the conclusion is divelish & detestable to all that love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, therefore the principles from which it flows are rotten, &

(a) *Quancunq; sententiam tulerint. Defens. Bel.* 3. 6. 4. 1239.

that

that Popish cause which cannot stand without such prodigious Blasphemies, ought to be abhorred by all that pretend to Christianity. And therefore the Popish glosse upon the place is false, and their Argument from it is wicked, and the true sence is this, they were bound to hearken to the Priests, if they delivered sentence according to the Law, and not, if they did grosly contradict it. And the rejection of this exposition, and the assertion of the peoples implicit Faith, hath forced several of them, who passe for sober men amongst our Adversaries, into such expressions as these, *That this action of the Priests* (in condemning Christ) *was indeed contrary to Christ, but their sentence was most true, and most profitable, yea that it was a divine Oracle.* So *Canus* (a) *That at that time the Priests had the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth.* So *Petrus a Soto* (b) *That the Acts of that Councel were wicked, but the sentence whereby they condemned Christ, was just and true.* So *Harding.* (c) Really Protestants must be tender in pressing their Arguments too farre, for the Papists, like wild Horses when they are chased, will venture over hedge and ditch. We have already made them turne Jewes, I am afraid next remove we shall dispute them into Paganisme, if they be not there already.

§. 13. And thus I have dispatched the Romanists pretensions from Scripture, for the Popes supreme and infallible Authority. If infallibility have any Foundation in Scripture, it is in these places: And how far they are from giving any countenance or support to their opinion I leave to that Reader to judg, who hath either sence or conscience, or any care of his Salvation. But

(a) *Nam sacerdotum veterum acta quidem Christo adversa fuerunt, ac sententia hominum alioqui pessimorum non solum verissima, sed reipub. etiam utilissima fuit. Quin divinum oraculum fuisse* Johannes *testatur. in operibus lib. 5. c. ult. pag.* 283. (b) *Non defuit tunc temporis sacerdotio Levitico Spiritus Propheticus, Spiritus sanctus, Spiritus veritatis. In Prolegomenis.* (c) Against *Jewels* Apology c. 6. divis. 3. par. 6.

I must not do them wrong, I confesse there is one Argument behind, and that is taken from St *Peter*'s prerogatives. And *Bellarmine* reckons up no lesse than twenty eight prerogatives, which all undoubtedly belong to the Pope: yes, that I confesse strikes all dead, and therefore I must crave the Readers pardon, and *Bellarmines* mercy, if I once do (as the Papists do ordinarily) passe over in silence what I cannot answer, for who can resist these Evidences? *Peters* Name is changed, *Ergo* the Popes Nature is changed from fallible to infallible. *Peter* is oft mentioned in the first place, therefore ought to have the first Seat, and is the chief Bishop. *Peter* walks with Christ upon the Water, and therefore the Pope must raigne with him upon Earth, and *Divisum imperium cum Iove Papa tenet.* *Peter* payes Tribute, and therefore the Pope should have a power of levying Tribute to reinburse him. Christ teacheth in *Peters* Ship, and therefore to quit scores, the Pope should rule in Christs Church. Christ bids *Peter* let down his Net, therefore the Pope must catch the Fish of Supremacy. Christ washeth *Peters* feet, therefore all men must kiss the Popes Toe. These and diverse other such prerogatives *Bellarmine* hath collected together, and vehemently argues from them for the Popes Supremacy, (a) but for these I must desire some time to give in my Answer.

I hope I have said enough to prove the second Proposition, *viz.* That the Scripture in it self is not a sufficient & solid foundation for a Papists Faith (according to their principles) and that the Popes pretended infallibility hath no solid foundation there. But when they are beaten out of Scripture, they use to fly to the Fathers, and to rest their Faith in the Authority of the Fathers: and therefore that must be considered in the next place.

(a) De Pontifice, lib. 1. c. 17. ad cap. 25.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the Authority and infallibility of the Fathers.

Prop. 3. *Sect.* 1. THe third Propoſition then is this: *The Faith of the Papiſts hath no ſolid foundation in the Authority of the Fathers.* This the rather deſerves conſideration, becauſe they make their great boaſt of it, and urge it as a principal pillar of their Faith. It is aſſerted in their Canon Law, *That the Fathers are to be owned and followed even to the leaſt jot.* And although ſome of them have declared their diſlike of that aſſertion, yet they generally agree in this, *That the Authority of the Fathers, eſpecially where they conſent, is a ſolid Foundation for their faith to reſt upon.* Hence thoſe expreſſions of their great Doctors, *Take away the Authority of Fathers, and Councels, and all things in the Church are doubtful & uncertain,* Eccius.(a) *From the writings of the Fathers, as from an Oracle, Univerſities have the certainty of their Aſſertions, and Councels have their decrees,*(b) *Sixtus Senenſis. Melchior Canus,* an Author of great note among the Romaniſts, laies down this Concluſion, *That the common ſence of the Fathers in the expoſition of Scripture, is a moſt certain Argument to confirm Theological aſſertions: For* (ſaith he) *the ſenſe of all thoſe Holy men is the ſenſe of God's Spirit.* And a little after, *Although you may require of a Philoſopher the reaſon of a Philoſophical Concluſion, yet*

(a) *Tollatur Patrum & Conciliorum authoritas, & omnia in Eccleſia erunt ambigua, dubia, pendentia, incerta. In Enchiridio de Conciliis.*

(b) *Ex ſcriptis ſanctorum Patrum velut ex oraculis Theologorum Academiæ aſſertionum ſuarum conſtantiam accipiunt, ſummique Pontifices decreta ſumunt, in Præfat. lib.* 5. *Biblioth.*

in

in the exposition of Holy Scripture, you are bound to believe your Ancestors, though they give you no reason for it, and to defend whatsoever opinions you receive from them, of the Law of Faith and of Religion. And a little after, *All those Holy men together cannot erre in a matter of Faith:* (a) *All the Fathers together do never erre, nor can they agree in one error,* saith *Bellarmine.* (b) *The sayings and Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers are not to be examined, when all or almost all do agree in one opinion,* saith *Salmeron.* (c) *That which the Fathers unanimously deliver about Religion is infallibly true,* saith *Gregorius de Valentia.* (d) From all which we plainly see, that according to their opinion, the judgment of the Fathers is a sure *basis* and ground of Faith. That is it which I am now to disprove, and to shew, That the Writings of the Fathers neither are, nor can be a safe and sufficient Foundation for a Papists Faith.

§. 2 Onely let me premise two things, 1. I would not be misunderstood, as if I did intend to derogate from the just Authority of the Fathers, or to defraud them of that veneration which is due to persons of such Antiqui-

---

(a) *In expositione sacrarum literarum communis omnium sanctorum veterum intelligentia certissimum argumentum Theologo praestat ad Theologicas assertiones corroborandas. Quippe sanctorum omnium sensus Spiritus sancti sensus ipse sit. — Quanquam à Philosophis quidem rationem Philosophicae conclusionis jure fortasse postulavis, in sacrarum autem literarum intelligentia majoribus nostris debes, nulla etiam ratione habita, credere, & quas sententias de lege, de fide, déque religione ab illis accepisti defendere.* Loc. Theolog. 7. c. 3. Concluf. 5. *Sancti simul omnes in fidei dogmate errare non possunt.* Ibid. Conc. 6. (b) *Patres nusquam omnes simul errant, etiamsi aliquis eorum interdum erret, nam simul omnes in ullo errore convenire non possunt.* Bel. lib. 2. de Christo cap. 2. & l. 1. de Purgat. c. 10 (c) *Non sunt probanda (examinanda) verum Patrum dicta & testimonia, quando omnes vel ferè omnes in unam sententiam conveniunt.* lib. 1. Epist. Pauli part. 3. disp. 6. in fine. (d) *Quod Patres unanimi consensu circa religionem tradunt, infallibiliter verum est.* in Analys fidei lib. 8. c. 8.

ty

ty, ability, and integrity, but onely to deny that pretended infallibility, which none did more dislike than themselves, as we shall see hereafter. Let them have all the honour which is due to the most worthy men, not acted by divine inspiration, but let them not have that honour which belongs to God onely, and his inspired ones. We grant their Testimony is highly credible, especially where there is indeed that which is oft pretended, but seldome proved, *viz.* an universal consent, but their Authority is not infallible. 2. That I do not fall into this dispute, as declining the judgment of the Fathers of the first 600 years, or suspecting their partiality on the Pope's side. I know sufficiently, and so may any man (whom the God of this World hath not blinded) that doth but read what our Learned Divines have said in this particular, or with his own Eyes look into the Fathers, that there is not one considerable point in controversie between us and the Romanists, but if judgment were to be given by any impartial person from the Fathers (excepting those who are evidently demonstrated to be spurious Authors) their mouths would presently be stopped and their cause and confidence laid in the Dust; onely because that work is so thoroughly done by others, and would swell this into voluminous bigness, I shall forbear that, and proceed to handle what I propoſed, and I shall prove the proposition by four Arguments.

1. All those Assertions and arguments which the Papists urge against the Authority of sacred Scripture, for the decision of controversies do no less overthrow all the Authority of the Writings of the Fathers. When they attempt to disprove the Authority of the Scriptures considered in themselves, these are the Arguments universally owned and urged: *God would not have his Church depend upon Paper-books*, saith *Costerus*. *Scripture* (say they) *cannot decide controversies, because it cannot*

summon

summon and hear both parties, it cannot compel transgressors to obedience, it doth not particularly condemne Hereticks: It doth not say, erras Jacobe Gretsere, *Gretser, you are in an error: It speaks doubtfully, and men dispute about the sence of Scripture, and so controversies will be endlesse.* Hence I thus argue; Either those Arguments are strong and cogent against the Scriptures Authority, or they are not: if they be not, then the Scripture must be owned as judge of Controversies, notwithstanding all those Arguments. If they be valid against the Authority of Scriptures, why are they not as strong against the Authority of the Fathers? Or what difference is there in this particular, between the writings of the Scripture and of the Fathers? Are the writings of St. *Paul* deaf, that they cannot hear parties, and dumb that they cannot deliver sentence, and can the writings of S. *Austin* hear and speak? Doth not the Scripture say, *Gretser* you are in an errour? And do the Writings of *Ierome* or *Ambrose* say, *Luther* you are in an errour? Cannot St. *Paul* condemne Hereticks, and compell transgressors to obedience, and can St. *Cyprian* do it? What offence hath St *Paul* done, that Peter's Successors should thus degrade him? sure, *Manet altâ mente repôstum*, they bare him a grudge for reproving St. *Peter*, Gal 2. and now they are even with him. In short, forasmuch as the Arguments and premises are wholly the same concerning the Scriptures and the Fathers, either the Authority of both of them must be received as Judges of Controversies, or else both must be rejected; for *in pari causâ idem jus*, say the Lawyers, *in the same case there is the same right.*

Again, another of their arguments, why the Scripture cannot of it self be a ground of Faith is this, because *without the Church we cannot know which books of Scripture are genuine, and which are spurious.* This is the great Argument of *Stapleton*, and all other Romish Doctors.

In

In like manner I argue the writings of the Fathers cannot in themselves be a solid ground of my Faith, because without the Churches judgment I cannot tell which of their Writings are genuine, and which are spurious. For that there are great multitudes of spurious Writings masked under the names of the Fathers, is acknowledged by *Sixtus Senensis*, *Bellarmine*, and others, and the Fathers themselves oft complained of that practice in their dayes. So again, *Scripture is obscure and ambiguous, and full of seeming contradictions, and there are many disputes about the true sence, and therefore it cannot be the rule of my Faith*, say *Bellarmine*, *Becanus*, *Costerus*, and the rest. The same may be more justly said against the Authority of the Fathers. Their obscurity and ambiguity appeares from the very same arguments which they bring to make good their charge against the Scriptures, even from the multitude of Comments which Learned men have made upon the dark passages of the Fathers, in which no lesse than in St *Pauls* Epistles are ἀσύνετα, things hard to be understood, which men of corrupt minds do wrest to their own destruction, & from the great disputes which are at this day fervent in the world, concerning the judgments of the Fathers, and their meaning in several passages about which there are as fierce contests as about any passages of the Scripture: it having been truely observed by indifferent persons, that both Papists and Protestants have fortified their several and contrariant assertions with plausible Arguments from the Fathers. Nor are there onely seeming contradictions in the Fathers (as there are in Scripture) but most real and direct ones; and if it be not enough that one of them contradicts another, many pregnant instances are given of the same Father in one place, contradicting himself in another. But for this & other things concerning the Fathers Authority, I must refer the Readers to those learned Authors

thors that have exemplified this in several instances. (a) Once more, *The Scripture* (they say) *is corrupted and falsified in several places, and so unfit to be a rule.* And have the Fathers Works seen no corruption? Yes, we have it under the hands of *Possevinus, Sixtus Senensis, Bellarmine*, and others, who confesse their hard hap in this particular, and how wofully they are corrupted in multitudes of places; and needs must the Fathers fare worse than the Scriptures herein, because they were never preserved with that care and conscience which was exercised about the Holy Scriptures, therefore either they must quit their Arguments against the Scriptures Authority, or else renounce the Authority of the Fathers, which is obnoxious to the same inconveniences.

§. 2. That the Fathers, whose writings are extant, (for of them this proposition treats) are not infallible, may be undeniably evinced from the Hypothesis of our Adversaries, and the supposed subject of that Infallibility which is pretended. Infallibility is the proper and peculiar priviledge of the Church, say all the Papists: The onely question is, *What this Church is?* Some make it the Pope, others a Councel, others the whole body of the Faithful, but they generally agree, that it must be some one or all of those: But the Fathers I am here discoursing of are not one, nor all of these, and therefore they cannot pretend to the supposed infallibility; nor can the Papists by their own principles ascribe it to them. To which may be added, That if the Pope himself, notwithstanding his pretended gift of infallibility, may erre as a private Doctor, either in speaking, or writing, (which all the Papists grant) how can either any, or most of them, who have no other capacity but that of a private Doctor, be exempt from a possibility of erring? & consequently the Fathers are not infallible, nor a solid foundation of a Papists faith.

(a) *Whitaker, Gerrard, Daillé.*

§. 3.

§. 5. Again, if they will needs obtrude upon us this upstart Infallibility of particular Fathers, I demand, whether this infallibility belongs to all the Fathers that lived in one Age, or onely to the Writers of that age, or onely to those of the Writers, whose works have had better hap than others to come to our hand, and whether to all them together, or onely to a part of them? For one of these they must unavoidably assert. If they say the first, that this Infallibility was in all the Fathers that lived in one Age, or the *major* part of them (as in reason they must, for what Scripture or Reason had one to pretend Infallibility more than another, excepting always the Bishop of *Rome*, of whose Infallibility, it must be confessed, there was never any question, *namely*, because in those dales none had the impudence to assert it) if that be granted, yet those few, whose writings are extant, (of whom alone our controversie is) might all be fallible, though the *major* part of the Fathers be acknowledged infallible. If it be said, those Fathers do not onely speak their own sence, but the sence of the Church of their Age, and in that respect, they are infallible; which is the common plea, and most plausible argument they use in this point, *The Fathers are infallible, not in their Expositions, but in their Traditions, and the Doctrine they deliver as received from their Ancestors*: Thus Sr. *Kenelm Digby*, *White*, *Holden*, and the Papists of the new Model. This I shall have occasion to handle more largely afterward: at present it may suffice to answer two things. 1. That it is most certain, they are so far from delivering the sence of the Church of that Age in the controversies between us and the Romanists, that they seldome touch upon the most of them, and when they do it, it is *obiter*, and by accident, not *ex professo*, and solemnly, they being then taken up with other matters, as disputing against Jewes and Gentiles, and the Heretick of that Age.

2. However, that being purely matter of Fact to understand, and report the History of the Churches doctrine in their Age, if they were infallible in matters of Faith, yet in point of Fact they were not infallible. For the Pope himself is allowed to be fallible in such matters, and as it is confessed, the Pope may erre, through fear or hope, or humane passions, (as *Liberius*, *Marcellinus*, and others did,) or at least for a season: so doubtless might the Fathers, either through weakness misunderstand, or through favour, or prejudice misreport the sense of others (of which it were easie to give many instances.) If the second thing be asserted, that this infallibility belongs only to the Writers of each Age, we would desire them to set their inventions on work, to devise a reason why the Writers were infallible, and not the Preachers, seeing the Apostles who had, and all others that pretend to infallibility (as the Pope and Councel,) challenge it equally in their Sermons, and Writings, in their verbal, and written Decrees, and much lesse can they with any colour assert, that this infallibility belongs onely to those writers which are come to our hands, as if it were not sufficient for the rest that they lost their writings, but they must also lose their infallibility. And yet such is the impudence of these men, and the desperateness of their cause, that they are found to attribute this infallibility, not onely to all conjunctly, but to the most of that small remnant of surviving Writers, as you saw from their expressions which because they are so monstrously bold as to assert, I shall take the boldness to ask, by what right shall five Fathers, viz. *Dionysius*, *Clement*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarpus*, and *Hermes*, supposing that all the works extant under their names were genuine (for these are all left us of those great numbers of the Fathers of the first age) I say, by what right shall these five invest themselves with the name or privilege of the whole Catholick Church of that Age; (for

it is to her alone the supposed promise of infallibility was made, in what Scripture, or Father, or Lexicon, do five Fathers make up the whole Church? True it is, the Pope hath a peculiar priviledge in this point, and is by the Jesuites invested with the name of the Church, *The Church virtual.* And it must be acknowledged there is some colour for the Title: for having swallowed up all the rights and priviledges of the Church, he ought to have the Name into the bargain. But setting aside that prodigious ἀναισθησία, I would know why I might not as well say, that five of the Romish Doctors, *viz. Salmeron, Canus, Costerus, Stapleton,* and *Bellarmine,* are the Church of *Rome,* or that five of our English Doctors are the Church of *England,* nay all the Protestant world, as that five of the Fathers made up the whole Church of their Age? Yet again, forasmuch as they attribe infallibility, not onely to all, but also the major part of the Fathers, of these five then, two may erre by their own confession. And that all the particular Fathers have their errors, is generally acknowledged by the Papists, and often urged by them to defend themselves from the force of many convincing allegations from the Fathers against their opinions. Well then, to keep to this particular instance: it is granted that *Dionysius* may erre and so may *Ignatius,* then the infallibility is preserved in *Clemens,* and *Polycarpus,* and *Hermes:* but they also, or any two of them may erre in other things, and then the infallibility is preserved in *Dionysius,* and *Ignatius,* and *Hermes.* Thus (it seems) infallibility is banded between the Fathers like a Tennis-ball, from one to another, and they have it by turnes. Such monsters must be in the Conclusion, if infallibility be in the premises. That is enough for the second Argument.

§. 5. The third Argument is this: the Fathers professe they are not infallible: either they say true or false;

if true, then they are not infallible, if false, then they erred in that assertion, and therefore are not infallible. So the Papists are gone by their own Argument, and rule too; for here we have the consent of the Fathers. It were infinite to recount all passages to this purpose: I shall onely suggest some few which are evident and undeniable in this particular. *Clemens Alexandrinus* hath these words. *The principle of our Doctrine is the Lord, who hath taught us by the Prophets, by the Gospel, and by the Apostles*, and he addes, *If any man think this principle needs another principle, he doth not indeed keep that principle.* But the Papists say, the Scripture-principle needs another principle to support it, *viz.* the Churches authority: *Ergo*, the Papists have forsaken the principle of the Scripture, and so saved us further labour of proving their Apostacy. And he addes, *that the standard, by which things are to be examined, is not the testimony of man* (therefore not the testimony of Fathers, Councels, Popes, who I think are all men, save onely that several of the Popes are represented by their own Authors as Beasts) *but the word of the Lord.* And lest you should understand it of Tradition, he calls it just before, the Scripture and word of the Lord: *We do not* (saith he) *believe the assertions of men, they must not onely say, but prove, and that too from the*

Lib. Stromatum 7. versus finem. Ἐχομεν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας τὸν Κύριον διὰ τε τῶν προφητῶν — καὶ Ἀποστόλων — τὸν ἀρχὴν δ' εἴ τις ἑτέρου δεῖσθαι ὑπολάβοι οὐκ ἔτ' ἂν ὄντως ἀρχὴ φυλαχθείη — οὕτω ἁπλῶς ἀποφαινομένοις ἀνθρώποις προσέχομεν οἷς καὶ ἀνταποφαίνεσθαι ἐπ' ἴσης ἔξεστιν εἰδ' οὐκ ἀρκεῖ μόνον ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν τὴν δόξαν, ἀλλὰ πιστώσασθαι δεῖ τὸ λεχθὲν, οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῇ πιστούμενα τὸ ζητούμενον.

Scrip-

Scriptures. What can be more expresse? So *Basil* (a) tels us, *The Hearers that are instructed in the Scriptures must examine the Doctrine of their Teachers, they must receive those things which are agreeable to Scripture, and reject those things which are contrary to it.* Where we plainly see S. *Basils* direct contrariety to the principles and practise of the Romish Church.

1. S. *Basil* allowes his hearers to examine their teachers Doctrine, so do not the Papists. *The people are so bound to be subject to their Pastours, that if their Pastours should erre, the people were bound to erre with them,* saith *Tannerus*[b]. *A Christian is bound to receive the Churches Doctrine without examination,* saith *Bellarmine.*[c] Pastours are simply to be heard in all things, nor are we to consider what is said, but who said it, *i.e.* if he were a lawful Pastour, as *Stapleton* (d) bellowes it out (for it is a speech fitter for a Beast than for a Man.) And yet these are the men who will not depart a Nailes breadth from the Fathers: This is the Church, the principal note whereof is consent with the Fathers, of which you may judge by this, and what we shall adde from others.

(a) In *Moralium regula 72. in initio.* Ὅτι δεῖ τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοὺς πεπαιδευμένους τὰς γραφὰς δοκιμάζειν τὰ παρὰ τῶν διδασκάλων λεγόμενα, καὶ τὰ μὲν σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς δέχεσθαι, τὰ δ' ἀλλότρια ἀποβάλλειν.

(b) In *Collatione Ratisbonensi.* §. 9.

(c) *Debet Christianus sine examine recipere Doctrinam Ecclesiæ.* Bellar. *de verbi Dei interpretatione. lib.* 3. *c.* 10.

(d) *In causa fidei non est considerandum quid dicatur, sed quis dicat.* Relect. con. 1. qu 4. art. 2. p. 91. *Ecclesiam audire Populum fidelem Christus jubet, Doctrinam Ecclesiæ populum expendere non jubet.* Stapleton *Tripliciat. adversus* Whitak. pro Eccles. Author. pag. 89. c. 9. *Et alibi. Voci Ecclesiæ in doctrina fidei simpliciter & absolutè acquiescendum est.* in Robert. con. 4. qu. art. 3.

2 *Basil* makes the Scripture alone the rule by which all other things are to be examined, not Fathers, nor Councels, nor Traditions: but the Papists are of another mind. S. *Clara* tels us of a *Popish Treatise, written by a friend of his, solemnly approved by the Parisian Doctors of the Sorbon* (so you see it is no particular fancy, but a received opinion) *where* (saith he) *that Author expresly asserts, that that Church therefore receives the Scriptures, because, and so far as, they are conformable to Tradition, not contrarily*, i. e. she doth not receive Tradition, because, and so far as it agrees with Scripture: *And thus far doubtless he was in the right*, saith S. *Clara*, and consequently *Basil* was in the wrong.

That saying of *Cyprians* is never to be forgotten, (b) *That Christ alone is to be heard, the Father witnesseth from Heaven. We are not therefore to regard what others before us thought, but what he that was before all, Christ first did, for we are not to follow the Custome of Men, but the Truth of God.* If the Papists would say as much, this controversie would be at an end. And it is observable, that *Pamelius*, who is very brisk and free of his Notes and Animadversions wherever *Cyprian* casts in a word that may seem to give countenance to their opinions, passeth over this place with profound silence, as well seeing it was so hot it would have burned his fingers.

(a) Prodiit quidam Dialogus—solenniter Parisiis approbatus—In quo expresse asserit Ecclesiam ideo recipere Scripturas, quia & in quantum sunt conformes fidei, quam ab Apostolis per traditiones accepit; non è converso. Et hactenus sine dubio rectissimè. Systemat. fidei c. 11. in initio.

(b) Quod solus Christus debet audiri, Pater de cœlo testatur—Non ergo debemus attendere quid alius ante, nos faciendum putaverit, sed qui ante omnes est Christus prior fecerit, neque enim hominis consuetudinem sequi oportet, sed Dei veritatem, Epistola 63 ad Cæcilium.

S. Christ

S. *Chrysostome* (a) is as fully Protestant in this particular (as if he had been of councel in our cause;) in two points he is positive for us: 1. He presseth the people to examine things delivered to them (therefore he was against the Popish implicit Faith,) *Let us not carry about the opinion of the multitude, but let us examine things*; and not contented to deliver the assertion, he adds a reason. *It is not absurd, that when you are to receive money, you do not trust other men, but examine it your selves, and when you are to judg of things, then to be drawn away by other mens opinions? And this* (saith he) *is the worse fault in you, because you have the Scriptures.* That brings in the second Heresie of *Chrysostomes*: The Rule by which he commands them to try all things is the Scripture, and (the mischiefe too is) he cals it a perfect Rule, *You have* (saith he) *an exact standard and Rule of all things:* and he concludes thus, *I beseech you do not regard what this or that man thinks, but enquire all things of the Scriptures.* I know no way to avoid this evident testimony but one: if I might advise them, the next Jesuite that writes, shall swear these words were foisted into *Chrysostomes* workes by the Protestants, and that they are not to be found in an old Manuscript Copy of *Chrysostome* in the Vatican.

What Protestant can deliver our Doctrine more fully than *Origen*: *It is necessary* (saith he) *that we should alledge the testimony of Scriptures, without which our Expositions do not command Faith:* (b) or than *Cyril*, *Do*

(a) 13. *Homilia in 2. ex. ad Corinth. versùs finem.* μὴ τὰ τῶν πόλλων δόξας περιφέρομεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ πράγματα ἐξετάσομεν — γραφὴν ἔχετε ἀκριβῆ ζύγον ἁπάντων καὶ γνώμονα καὶ κανόνα — ἀφέντες τὸ τῷ δεῖνι καὶ τῷ δεῖνι δοκεῖ περὶ τούτων παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν ταῦτα πάντα πυνθάνεσθε.

(b) *Necesse est nobis Scripturas sanctas in testimonium vocare, sensus quippe nostri, & enarrationes nostræ sine his testibus non habent fidem.* Homil. 1 in Jerem.

not

not believe me saying these things, unlesse I prove them out of the Scriptures [c]. Or than *Ambrose*, thus speaking to the Emperour *Gratian*, *I would not you should believe our Argument or disputation, let us aske the Scriptures, aske the Prophets, the Apostles,* [d]. S. *Austin* had none of the Fathers in greater veneration then *Cyprian*, and *Ambrose*; yet hear how he speaks of them: of *Cyprian* thus: (e) *I am not obliged by his Authority, I do not look on his Epistles as Canonical, but I examine them by the Scripture, and what is repugnant thereunto, with his good leave I reject it.* Would the Papists give us but this liberty, we should desire no more: and of *Ambrose* he saith the like.

Peradventure it will be said in this point, as it is in the general, That although it is confessed by the Fathers, that particular Doctors are liable to error, yet in such things wherein the Fathers do unanimously agree, they have an infallible Authority, and are a sufficient Foundation of Faith.

To this I answer, 1. If this were granted, it doth not in the least secure the Romists concernments, because there is not one of all those points controverted between them and us, wherein such unanimous consent can be produced, but in every one of them there are pregnant allegations out of some of the Fathers repugnant to their opinions and assertions. This their learned men cannot but know, and if they have any ingenuity in them, they cannot deny.

(c) Μὴ πίστευε τοῖς ταῦτα λέγουσι ἄνευ τῶν γραφῶν πείσωσι. Catechesi 4.

(d) *Nolo Argumento nostro credas, Sancte Imperator, aut nostræ disputationi, Scripturas interrogemus, interrogemus Apostolos, interrogemus Prophetas, interrogemus Christum* lib. 1. de fide ad Gratianum.

(e) *Eius Authoritate non teneor, ejus literas non ut Canonicas habeo, cæs ex Canonicis considero, quod Scripturæ non congruit, cum pace ejus, respuo.* in lib. 2. contra Cresconium cap. 13.

2. I answer with *Whitaker* against *Durens*, urging this very plea. *What a silly thing is it to deny, that that which hapned to each of them, cannot possibly happen to all of them.* [a] And with *Gerhard*, *the Testimonies of the Fathers collectively taken, cannot be of another kind and nature, than they are distributively* [b]. Nor can any man deny the truth of the Proprosition, if he apprehends the meaning of it; for how can the same persons, being onely considered under a double notion, be both fallible and infallible at the same time: And if *Austin*, *Ambrose*, *Cyprian*, (supposing these were all the Fathers) be each of them fallible, how can a meer collective consideration of them render them infallible?

3. I Answer with Learned Dr. *Holdsworth*, That the Fathers deny this Infallibility, not onely to one or two of them dispersedly, but to all the Antients collectively considered, [c] and this I shall prove onely by one Argument. They that make Infallibility the peculiar property of the Canonical Writers, deny the infallibility of the Fathers, either collectively, or distributively considered: But the Fathers make Infallibility the peculiar property of the Canonical Writers, and abjudicate it from all other Writers. S. *Jerome* is expresse, *Except the Apostles, whatsoever else is afterward said, let it be cut off,*

(a) *Quàm hoc ineptum est quod singulis contigit, id negare posse in omnes cadere. Contra Durœum lib. 6. De firmamentis Patrum. p. 414.*

(b) *Patrum singulorum testimonia collective sumpta non possunt esse alterius generis quam singula sunt distributivè.* Confess. Cathol. lib. 1. par. 2. c. 13.

(c) *Non solùm de uno aut altero sparsim, sed de omnibus veteribus gregatim in scriptis suis Patres ubique pronuntiant & eorum dogmata esse ad Scripturas expendenda ut probentur, & eorum testimonia ex Scripturis æstimanda, ut ex istarum consensu aut dissensu magis minúsve valeant ad fidei controversias dirimendas.* Lect. 4ª.

for

for it hath no Authority (a). And again, *I make a difference between the Apostles and other Writers, those alwaies said Truth, but these in some things did erre.* (b)

S. *Austin* makes this difference between the holy Scriptures and all other Writings, That *those are to be read with a necessity of believing, but these with a liberty of judging* (c). What living man can expresse the Protestant Doctrine in more evident termes than the same Father elsewhere doth. *That which is confirmed by the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, is without doubt to be believed, but for other witnesses and testimonies* (whether more or fewer agreed, or divided, all is one to St. *Austin*) *you may receive them or reject them as you shall judge, they have more or lesse weight* (d). And again, when he was pressed by *Jerome* with the Authority of six or seven of the Greek Fathers, he thus Answers: (e) *I have learned to give this honour and reverence to the books of Scripture, to believe there is no error in them: But as for others, how Learned or Godly soever they be, I so read them that I do not believe any thing to be true, because they thought so,*

(a) *Exceptis Apostolis, quodcunq; aliud postea dicitur, abscindatur, non habet postea authoritatem.* in Psal. 86. (b) *Scito me aliter habere Apostolos, aliter reliquos tractatores, illos semper vera dicere, istos in quibusdam, ut homines errare.* Epist. 62. ad Theoph. Alex.

(c) *Id genus literarum à nobis non cum credendi necessitate, sed cum judicandi libertate legendum est.* Contra Faustum l. 11. c. 5.

(d) *Quod divinarum Scripturarum perspicua firmatur Autoritate, sine ulla dubitatione credendum est: aliis verò testibus vel testimoniis tibi credere vel non credere liceat, quantum ea, momenti ad faciendam fidem vel habere vel non habere perpenderis.* Epist. 112. ad Paulinum.

(e) *Solis Scripturarum libris —— didici hunc timorem honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum scribendo errâsse firmissimè credam. —Aliis autem ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate, doctrinaque præpolleant, non ideo verum putem, quia ipsi ita senserunt, sed quia per Canonicas persuadere potuerunt.* Tom. 2. Epist. 19.

but

but because they proved it so to be by the Scriptures. To conclude, so evident is S. *Austin*'s judgment in this point, that it forced this ingenious confession from a learned and acute Papist, *Occam* by name, who speaking of a passage of S. *Austins* about it, hath these words. *It is to be noted, that* Austin *in that authority speaking of other writers beside the Pen-men of the Scripture, makes no difference among these Non-Canonical Writers: and therefore whether they be Popes, or others, whether they writ in Council, or out of Council, the same judgment is to be passed upon them.* (a) You see S. *Austin*'s mind is plain, and doth (our Adversaries themselves being judges) directly overturne that great fundamental point of the Infallibility of Councels and Popes (which, if you will believe them, is not only true but necessary to Salvation) and yet these are the men that walk in the good old paths. These are they, that maintain no Doctrine, but what hath been conveyed to them by the Fathers. I know no Salvo but that which they use in the great Article of Transubstantiation, *viz.* to tell us, we must not believe our selves when we read such passages in the Fathers, and that together with the eyes of our Mind, our Reasons, and Consciences, we must give up the eyes of our body to the Popes disposal. And this doctrine of *Austins* (if you will believe the Romanists) when delivered by the Protestants, is a new and upstart doctrine, never heard of in the world till *Luther*'s dayes; and by this you may judge of the justice of that charge, when the like is said of our other doctrines. I might fill up a Treatise with pertinent citations out of the Fathers to this

(a) *Notandum quòd Augustinus in authoritate illa loquens de Scriptoribus aliis à Scriptoribus Bibliæ, inter hos Scriptores & illos non distinguit: & ideo, sive fuerint summi Pontifices, sive alii, sive scripserint aliquid in Concilio, sive extra, consimile de eis judicium est habendum.* Part. 3. Dialog. tract. 1. l. 3. c. 24.

purpose

purpose, but this is enough for any but those, who are resolved to sacrifice their consciences to the Popes ambition, and for them it is too much.

§. 7. The fourth and last Argument is this: The Papists themselves, whatever sometimes they pretend, yet indeed do not make the Fathers the ground and foundation of their Faith, but acknowledg them fallible. 1. This appears from what hath already been discoursed concerning their avowed Doctrine, That Infallibility is the proper and peculiar priviledge of the Church, and consequently belongs not to the Fathers in their single capacities. 2. It appears from the acknowledged novelty of several Romish Doctrines, which their most learned men confesse cannot be proved from the Fathers. Such are

1. The Doctrine of forbidding the reading of the Scripture to Lay-men (as they are called:) *We confesse in their days*, (viz. of *Jerome* and *Augustine*) *Lay-men were conversant in the reading of the Scripture*, saith Acosta.[a] And whereas many Popish Authors expound those words *Joh.* 5. 39. ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφὰς indicatively, as if they did onely acquaint us with the practice of the Jewes, and not contain a command of Christ to his hearers to read the Scriptures. *Tolet* and *Maldonate*[b] both witnesse, that *Chrysostome, Theophylact, and Augustine, and all weighty Authors, except Cyril, do understand it imperatively for a command of Christ.*

2. They acknowledg the novelty of Transubstantiation. The words of *Scotus* are these: [c] *Before the Lateran Councel, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was no point of*

(a) *Fatemur tunc temporis (sub ætate Hieronymi & Chrysostomi) laicos in Scripturarum lectione versatos fuisse. Instit. Moral. l. 8. c. 26.*

(b) *In locum.* (c) *Prout recitatur à Bellar. de Euchar. l. 3. c. 23. unum addit Scotus, quod minimè probandum est, Ante Lateranense Concilium non fuisse dogma fidei Transubstantiationem.*

faith

Faith: and the first *Lateran* Councel was above 1100 years after Christ's Birth. And *Alphonsus de Castro* delivers this memorable Assertion: *Many things are known to latter Authors, which the Antient writers were wholly ignorant of, for these seldome make any mention of Transubstantiation.* [a]

3. The Doctrine of Indulgencies and Purgatory (I joyn them both together, as being neer of kin) of which Bishop *Fisher* hath this remarkable passage. (*b*) *No Orthodox Christian now doubts whether there be a Purgatory, though the Antients seldome or never mentioned it.* And a little after, *Considering that Purgatory was for a good while unknown:--* and again, *seeing then Purgatory was known and received in the Church so lately, who can wonder that Indulgencies were not used in the primitive Church?* So *Gabriel Biel:* [c] *Before the times of* S. *Gregory* (and that was 600 years after Christ) *there was little or no use of Indulgencies: but now they are used frequently, because the Church without doubt hath the spirit of Christ, and therefore cannot erre.* That *sine dubio* did his work, for I was about to dispute against his assertion, but that phrase quite took away my courage. You see it is a courtesie that the Papists will condescend to prove their doctrine from Scrip-

---

(a) *Multa sunt posterioribus nota, quæ vetusti illi scriptores prorsus ignoraverunt. Nam de Transubstantiatione — rara est in antiquis scriptoribus mentio. l. 8. contra hæreses in verbo* Indulgentia.

(b) *Nemo jam dubitat orthodoxus an Purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud Priscos nulla vel quàm rarissima fiebat mentio ——— Contemplantes igitur aliquandiu Purgatorium incognitum fuisse. Cum itaq; Purgatorium tam serò cognitum ac receptum fuerit Ecclesiæ, quis jam de Indulgentiis mirari potest, quod in principio nullus fuerit earum usus.* Roffensis *in confutatione* Lutheri. *p.* 96.

(c) *Ante tempora beati Gregorii modicus vel nullus fuit usus Indulgentiarum. Nam autem crebrescit earum usus, quia Ecclesia sine dubio habet spiritum Christi, ideoq; non errat. in lect. 57. super Canonem Missæ.*

ture

ture and Fathers, whereas if they would stand upon their Termes, they might argue thus: The conclusion without doubt is true, that the Church cannot erre; therefore a fig for the premises. So *Durandus*: (a) *Concerning Indulgencies little can be said with any certainty, because the Scripture speaks not expresly of them; and the holy Fathers, Aug: Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, do not at all mention them.* And *Cajetan* expresly: (b) *No sacred Scripture, no authority of ancient Fathers, either Greek or Latin, hath brought the rise of Indulgencies to our knowledge.* And yet (if you please to believe it) this and all the doctrines of the Romish Church are no other than such as have been handed to them from the Apostles by all the ancient Fathers in an uninterrupted succession. I believe I could instance in twenty several Articles of the Romish Church for which they have no colour of Authority from any of the Fathers. But this may suffice for a Specimen of that respect which the Papists had for the Fathers, when they do not comply with their Humors. The Fathers were so ignorant for a thousand years together, that they did not understand, or so negligent, that they did not instruct their people in that great mystery of Transubstantiation, (than which none was more necessary to be taught, because none more difficult to believe.) The Fathers were so hard-hearted and cruel, that they would suffer Souls to fry in Purgatory for hundreds of years together, whom they might have certainly released by the help of Indulgencies. The Fathers were so indiscreet, that they allowed their Hearers to read the Scriptures, and have them in a

(a) De Indulgentiis pauca dici possunt per certitudinem, quod ut Scriptura expresse de eis loquitur. --Sancti etiam, ut Ambr. Hilar. Aug. Hier. nihil loquuntur de Indulgentiis. in lib. 4. de sentent. dist. 20. qu. 3. cum 4. (b) Nulla Scriptura sacra, nulla priscorum doctorum Graecorum vel Latinorum authoritas Indulgentiarum ortum ad nostram deduxit notitiam. Opusc. 15. 6. 1.

vulgar

vulgar tongue. But *now it is not fit to be granted*, saith *Sixtus Senensis*[a]: The Church of *Rome* hath got a monopoly of all knowledg, fidelity, tender-heartedneſſe, (which you will wonder at) diſcretion, and all good qualities, and Infallibity into the bargain.

This is the excellency of the Romiſh Faith, that it is calculated for any Meridian. Are any of their doctrines ſeemingly favoured by the Fathers? why then you ſhall have large Harangues concerning the Authority of the Fathers, and their adherence to them. Are there any of their points, wherein the Fathers are either ſilent or opponent? why they are furniſhed with another ſtrain: that *the Fathers were but private Doctors, and had their failings. The chief of the Fathers had their falls*, ſaith *Bellarmine*. [b] *In the books of the Ancients, which the Church reads as authentick, ſometimes are found wicked and hereticall paſſages*, ſaith *Sixtus Senenſis*. And ſo long as the Church of *Rome* reſerves to her ſelf alwayes a liberty of determining what paſſages are wicked and hereticall, I trow ſhe is out of Gun ſhot: *I doe not value* Origen's *judgment*, ſaith *Peterius*.(c) And that you may ſee the Papiſts do *inſanire cum ratione*, I pray you take notice, that what they want in conſcience and honeſt dealing, they make up in wit, and therefore have deviſed ſeveral ingenious ſhifts, whereby they can elude the moſt pregnant teſtimonies of the Fathers levied againſt them. Sometimes they anſwer, that the Fathers ſpeak ἀγωνιστῶς in oppoſition to the preſent Adverſary they were diſputing with, not ἀγωνιστῶς, as laying down their own poſitive opinion: thus *Perron*,(d) and *Sixtus Senenſis*(e) ſome-

(a) *Lib. 6. Biblioth. annot.* 152. (b) *Practical Patrum lapſi ſunt. de verbo Dei lib.* 3. *c.* 10. [b] *In libris ſanctorum doctorum, quos Eccleſia legit Eccleſia, nonnunquam inveniuntur quædam prava & hæretica. Præf. in lib.* 5. *Biblioth.* (c) *in Rom.* 3. *diſp.* 6. (d) *Lib.* 1. *de Euchar. p.* 52.

(e) *Præfat. in lib.* 5. *Biblioth.*

times

times they say the Fathers speak *declamatorio more*, hyperbolically, and by excesse. Thus *Sixtus Senensis* answers our Allegations from the Fathers for reading the Scripture. [a] Thus *Petavius* answers a clear passage of *Chrysostomes* against Auricular Confession. [b] At other times they tell us, the Fathers did not alwaies speak what they thought, but what they saw necessary to confute their Adversaries: thus *Perron* answers the citations from the Fathers against Creature-worship. If you alledge the Epistles of the Fathers, they tell you, the Fathers did not use fully to open their minds in those writings. So *Perron* answers a Testimony of *Austins* against Transubstantiation. Sometimes they plead, that the Fathers speak the opinion of others, not their own; as *Bellarmine* answers a place out of *Hierome*. [c] If you bring any passage out of their Poems, they say the Fathers did use Poetical liberty, as *Bellarmine* answers to *Prudentius* (d). So just was the judgment of the University of *Doway* upon *Bertram's* Book, of the body and bloud of Christ: *Seeing we bear many errors in the Antient Fathers, and extenuate and excuse them, and oftentimes by some devised fiction we deny and put a convenient sense upon them, when they are opposed against us in disputations with our Adversaries, we do not see why* Bertram *doth not deserve the same equity, and diligent recognition.* (e) And thus they deale with the Fathers, when they displease their humour, and oppose their Doctrines. But if the Fathers deliver any thing that

(a) *Lib. 6. Bibl. annot. 5.* (b) *Animadver. in Epiphanii hæres. 55 pag. 144.* (c) *Lib. de gratia primi hominis. c. 11.* (d) *De Purgatorio. lib. 2. c. 18.*

(e) *Cum in veteribus aliis plurimos feramus errores & extenuemus, excusemus, excogitato commento persæpe negemus, & commodum iis sensum affingamus, dum opponuntur in disputationibus, aut conflictionibus cum adversariis, non videmus cur non eandem æquitatem & diligentem recognitionem mereatur Bertramus. Vide Ind. expurg. in lit. B.*

seems

seems to countenance their conceits, then every passage of the Fathers is dogmatical, and every word an argument: then the Fathers have done playing and quibling, then they have opened their minds fully, and given us their most serious and last thoughts.

§ 8. And lest you should think it was onely the opinions of several Fathers which they despised, I shall acquaint you with their practice, in case of consent of the Fathers, or the major part of them. That the Angels were corporeal, was the opinion of most of the Fathers, saith *Pererius*.[a] For this opinion *Sixtus Senensis* reckons up *Origen*, *Lactant*: *Athanasius*, *Methodius*, *Hilarius*, *Damascenus*, *Cassianus*, and the second Councel of *Nice*, to whom *Maldonat* addes, as ὁμολόγους, *Clemens Alexand*: *Theodoret*, *Tertullian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, &c. such a constellation one shall seldome find in any controverted opinion: Yet hear what *Senensis* saith, *I think the contrary opinion is the truest*. If a Protestant had said as much, what tumults and Tragedies would it have raised in the Roman Court? How would all the world have rang with it? So again, that I may further lay open this Romish imposture, I shall represent to the Readers consideration that controversie concerning the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, which is the common and current Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* at this day, is sufficiently known from the decree of the Councel of *Trent* concerning Original sin, (in which decree they expressly tell us, they would not have her included) (*b*) and from the severe constitutions of *Sixtus* the fourth,

(a) *Lib. 1. in Gen. dis. 106.*

(b) *Declarat sancta Synodus non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc Decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam & immaculatam Virginem Mariam Dei genitricem. Conc. Trident. in sess 5.*

and *Paul* the fifth, and *Gregory* the fifteenth Popes, against those that shall presume to teach this Doctrine, *that the blessed Virgin was conceived in sin*, and from the practice of diverse Popish Universities, who have not onely received the doctrine of the immaculate Conception of the Virgin, but bind their members by solemn Oath to own it, and from the writings of multitudes of the most eminent Popish Writers, who positively assert it, as *Delrio, Henriquez, Azorius, Suarez, Vasquez, Salmeron, Acosta, Abulensis, Canus, Navarrus*, and a world of others. Now let us see, whether in this point they made the consent of Fathers their rule, or (which is equivalent) what was the judgment of the antient Fathers therein: which I shall give you from the mouths of the Papists themselves, than which they cannot desire a fairer trial. Hear *Canus*: *All the Antients that make any mention of this matter, have with one mouth asserted, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in sin, as Ambrose, Aug. Chrys.* &c. *and none of them contradicted that assertion*: and then he addes his *omnino*, and the Romish opinion, *That the argument from Authority is weak, and the contrary doctrine is probably and piously defended in the Church of Rome* (a). And he confesseth, *he knew no other way to confute this argument of* Erasmus *against the authority of the Fathers, than by saying the opinion was not* de fide, *or no matter of Faith* (b). A Remedy as bad as the Disease.

1. Because the opinion is most absurd, that a Doctrine

(a) *Sancti (antiqui) omnes, qui in eius rei mentionem inciderunt, uno ore asseverârunt Beatam Virginem in peccato originali conceptam,— & nullus sanctorum contravenit; Infirmum tamen ex omnium authoritate argumentum ducitur, quin potius contraria sententia probabiliter & pie defenditur. loc. theol. lib. 7. c. 1.*

(b) *Ibid. c. 3.*

is not *de fide*, till the Pope or Councel have determined it, from whence would follow amongst many other grosse absurdities, 1. That it was not *de fide* while Christ lived that Jesus was the Messias, no Councel having determined it. 2. That most of the Articles of the Christian Religion were not *de fide* before the Councel of *Nice*. 3. That God revealing a truth in his holy Scriptures cannot oblige our Faith as much as a Councel revealing it in their Decrees. But I need say no more of this, because it is rejected by diverse of their own most learned Authors. *It is the common opinion of Doctors, that a Councel doth not make a thing to be of Faith, but denies or declares, that such a thing is, or formerly was* de fide, *as the Holy Fathers abundantly confirme*, saith *White* (a).

2. Because this was *de fide*, according to their own Doctrine: For the Councel of *Basil* had positively defined and determined it, as pious and agreeable to Faith, Reason, and Scripture, to be embraced by all Catholicks, and that it should be lawful to no man to teach the contrary. (*b*) This put S. *Clara* so hard to it, that he is forced to this horrible shift, that they onely defined it, *tanquam piam & consonam fidei*. Now the termes *tanquam & consonam* are termes of diminution (*c*). But to return: *Salmeron* treating of this point tels us, that his Adversaries reckon 200, others 300 Fathers against his and the Romish Doctrine of the immaculate conception: Well, what is his Answer? Really, it is so full of Heresie that I fear they willl chide me for translating it: he tels you, *The Argument from Authority is weak. I answer,*

(a) *Communis Doctorum sententia fert Concilium non facere aliquid de fide, sed decernere esse seu prius fuisse de fide, ut sancti etiam Patres abundè confirmant. De fide & Theologia. tract. 2. sect. 22.*

(b) *Sess. 36.* (c) *in systemate fidei. c. 35. p. 377.*

(saith he) *from Exod.* 23.2. *Thou shalt not speak in a cause to incline after many to wrist judgment, as* Augustine *answered the Donatists, it was a sign that a cause wanted Truth, which leaned upon Authority; That the younger Doctors see further than the Antients:* that is to say, the Romish Doctors are wiser than the Antient Fathers. [a] I recommend these passages to the care of my Lords the Inquisitors, the next time the purging humour takes them, they richly deserve a room in the *Index expurgatorius.*

And yet these are the onely Adorers of the Antient Fathers, that tell you, *we do not receive part of the Doctrine of the Fathers, and reject part, but we imbrace it all,* saith *Durœus* [b], *We hold the whole Volumes* saith *Campian* [c], *These* are they that hold the Fathers to be *uncorrupted judges of Controversies, whom God would not suffer to fall into errour, and lead others into it,* saith *Costerus* [d]. Will you see more of this mystery of Iniquity? I shall onely name the rest: Diverse Popish Authors of prime note acknowledge that it was the general opinion of the Fathers, that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper ought to be given to Infants. So *Maldonate The opinion of S.* Augustine, *and* Innocent *the first,* (a Pope, and therefore his

---

(a) *Argumentum ab authoritate infirmum est—Respondemus ex verbo Dei Exod.* 23. 1. *In judicio plurimorum non acquiesces sententiæ ut vero devies, cùm Augustinus respondeat Donatistis signum esse causæ in veritatis nervo destitutæ, quæ soli multorum authoritati, qui errare possunt innititur. Doctores quò juniores eò perspicaciores sunt. Disp.* 51. *in Rom.* 5.

(b) *Nos Patrum Doctrinam non aliqua ex parte admittimus, alia repudiamus, sed integram amplectimur. Contra Illiak. fol.* 140.

(c) *Tenemus integra volumina. In decem rationibus rat.* 5.

(d) *Incorrupti sunt Judices controversiarum, neque enim credibile est eos, præsertim in rebus quæ fidem attingunt, à Deo sic destitutos fuisse, ut ipsi errarint, doctrinamq; suam ad eos in errorem induxerint. In Enchirid. p.* 64.

opinion

opinion infallibly true) *flouriſhed in the Church for* 600 *years that the Euchariſt was neceſſary to Infants.* [a] That the Lords Supper ſhould be received by the people in both kinds. For the Councel of *Conſtance* in that very place where it takes away one kind (the Cup) doth acknowledge that the uſe of both kinds by the people was inſtituted by Chriſt, and enjoyed by the people in the antient Church [b]. That the Saints departed ſhould not be admitted to the viſion of God before the day of judgment: So much *Perron* confeſſeth, and *Sixtus Senenſis*, [c] that the Saints ſhall raign with Chriſt a thouſand years, that *Pamelius* grants [d]. In all theſe and ſeveral others, it is known that the Church of *Rome* aſſerts the contrary, how truly and juſtly I diſpute not, nor is it material to my purpoſe, which was onely to ſhew how upon all occaſions, where need requires, they do as little regard the Authority of the Fathers as any, whom they moſt traduce for ſo doing But would you know the myſtery of this? why, *The Fathers are not reckoned as Fathers when they deliver any thing which they did not receive from the Church*, ſaith *Dureus* [e]. In earneſt, that ſaying deſerved a Cardinals Cap. And *Baily* the Jeſuite ſeconds him in it, where putting this queſtion, *Whether the Authority of the Doctors* (Fathers) *ought to be admitted?* He anſwers, *Yes, as far as the Church approves of them* (f) *q. d.* The Fathers have Authority with us as far as we pleaſe:

(a) *Miſſam facio Auguſtini & Innocentii* 1. *ſententiam qui ſexcentos circiter annos viguit in Eccleſia Euchariſtiam etiam infantibus neceſſariam. in Joh.* 6. *verſ.* 53. (b) *Seſſione* 13. (c) *Lib.* 6. *Bibl. Annot.* 345. (d) *In notis ſuper Cypriani hortationem ad martyrium.*

(e) *Neque enim Patres cenſentur, cum ſuum aliquid, quod ab Eccleſia non acceperunt, ſcribunt vel docent. coll: Whit. ubi ſupra.* (f) *Debetne admitti Doctorum* (Patrum) *authoritas? Dubet quatenus ab Eccleſia approbatur. in Catechiſ.*

I will adde a third (that you may see it is a ruled case:) and that is *Gretzerus*, *A Father*, saith he, *is one that feeds the Church with wholsome Doctrine: but if in stead of Corne he give Chaff, or Tares, he is not now a Father but a Step-Father, not a Teacher but Seducer.**

When the Fathers say any thing which seems to countenance their positions, then they are Fathers, uncorrupt Judges, infallible interpreters, and Purgatory is too mild a punishment for him that shall go one haires breadth from them. But if the Fathers will once begin to take upon them, if they will exceed those bounds the Pope hath set them, and contradict his interest or opinion, then it is time to take them a peg lower, then they call them Fathers, but make Children of them: They had better have held their Tongues, for now all comes out, and the Papists are the *Chams* (as they call the Protestants) who uncover their Fathers Nakednesses: Then *Eusebius* (who when he is Orthodox in the Roman account passeth for a *most famous Writer, a most Learned man, and a Catholick* with *Lindanus* [a], *Sixtus Senensis* [b], and others) is all on a sudden Transubstantiated into an *Arrian* Heretick with *Costerus* (c), and *Baronius* (d). Then poor *Tertullian* (who, when he speaks righteous things, passeth for a *most noble Author*, *the chief of all the Latin Fathers* with *Lindanus* (e), is not so much as a *man of the Church*,

---

* *Nam Ecclesiæ Pater ille dicitur qui Ecclesiam salutari doctrina alit & pascit — Jam verò si pro salutifero doctrinæ pabulo — offerat & adducat lolium & zizania — perversorum dogmatum — eatenus non Pater est sed vitricus, non doctor sed seductor.* In *lib.* 2. *de jure ac more prohibendi libros noxios. cap.* 10.

(a) *Panopl. l. c.* 17. § *inprimis.* (b) *Apud Baron. in Anal. tom.* 3. *an.* 340. (c) *Hæreticus Arrianus. In Apologia contra Grevinchonium c.* 8. *n.* 9. (d) *Loco jam citato.*

(e) *Nobilis admodum Author, Latinorum omnium facilè Princeps. Panop. lib.* 1. *c.* 3.

may

nay, he is *an heretical Author, an Heresiarch, a Montanist* say *Azorius* [a] and *Bellar.* [b] Then *Origen* (who when he is a good boy, passeth for *a Witnesse beyond exception* with *Duræus*, [c] *another master of the Churches after the Apostles, as Jerome cals him*, saith *Lindanus* [d]) is a meer *Schismatick* saith *Canus* [e], *the Father of the Arrians and Eunomians*, saith *Maldonate* [f]. Then *Constantine* himself (that you may see the Church of *Rome* is not guilty of respect of persons) *is not much to be regarded, he was a greater Emperour than Doctor*, saith *Bellarm.* [g] Then Lactantius *is better skill'd in* Tully *than in the Scriptures* and Victorinus *was a Martyr but wanted Learning*, saith *Bellarmine* [h]. Nay, I think both He and the rest of the Fathers wanted wit as well as learning: for if they would but have blotted out all Anti-Romish passages (which might have been done with one blot, provided it reached from the beginning to the end of their works) they had all passed for Orthodox and admirable men, and we had not heard one word of their infirmities or miscarriages.

What need I trouble my self and the Reader with saying that which all the World knowes concerning the Papists receding from the common sence of the Fathers in expositions of Scripture, and preferring new interpretations before them, not fearing their own Tridentine thunderbolt, *That no man should dare to interpret Scripture*

---

a *Tom.* 1. *Moral. lib.* 8. *cap.* 16. b *lib.* 1. *de sanctis c.* 5. c *Testis omni sanè exceptione maior. contra Whitak. fol.* 109. d *Alterum Ecclesiarum post Apostolos Magistrum aiebat Hieronymus. Panop. lib.* 3. *c.* 26. e *Loc. com. lib.* 7. *c.* 3. *num.* 11. f *In Johan.* 1. 3. g *De verbo Dei l.* 4. *c.* 11. h *Lactantius magis librorum Ciceronis quàm Scripturarum sanctarum peritus. Victorinus martyr quidem fuit, sed ei eruditio defuit. Lib.* 1. *de sanctis. c.* 5. *in fine.*

against the common consent of the Fathers a. For which I shall onely referre the Reader to those places where he may be more fully satisfied, that this was the opinion and practice of the Learned and approved Romanists, as *Cajetan* b, *Pererius* c, *Maldonate* d, and several others e.

§. 9. In short, to strike the businesse dead, you shall have the positive Judgment of the principal pillars of the Romish Church. *Sacred Doctrine* (saith *Aquinas*) *useth authority of Scripture as a necessary Argument, but the Authorities of other Doctors of the Church onely as a probable Argument: for our Faith leanes upon the revelation made to the Apostles and Prophets, and to other Doctors* f. *The Authorities of the Fathers without the Scripture doth not oblige my Faith,* saith *Biel* g. *It is the property of the Holy Scriptures, that there is no error in it which needs correction,* saith *Baronius* h. *The writings of the Fathers* (saith *Bellarmine in totidem terminis*) *are not a rule, and have not authority to oblige me* i. And not contented to assert, he elsewhere offers proofs of the invalidity of the

---

a *Sessione* 4. b *In Præfatione in Pentateuchum.* c *lib.* 3. *in Gen. qu.* 5. *n.* 45. d *in multis locis Job* 8. 56. *Mat.* 16. 18. *&* 19.

e *Stella in Luc.* 16. 21. *Baronius in Annal. Tom.* 1. *An.* 34. *Patres in interpretatione Scripturarum non semper —— Catholicam Eccl. fidem sequuntur.*

f *Sacra Doctrina Authoritatibus Canonicæ Scripturæ utitur propriè ex necessitate Argumentando, authoritatibus autem aliorum Doctorum Ecclesiæ arguendo ex propriis, sed probabiliter. Innititur enim fides nostra revelationi Apostolis & Prophetis factæ —— non autem revelationi, si quæ fuit, aliis Doctoribus factæ. Part.* 1. *qu.* 1. *art.* 8.

g *Authoritates Patrum sine Scripturis non obligant ad fidem. Lect* 41. *in Canon. Missæ.*

h *Divinæ tantùm Scripturæ, nihil habere erroris, quod corrigatur. Tom.* 4. *Annal. An.* 369. i *Patrum scripta non sunt regula, nec habent authoritatem obligandi. De Concil. lib.* 2. *c.* 12. *§. Dico secundo.*

Father

Fathers without, and their perfect subjection to the Authority of the Church and Bishop of *Rome*. *The Fathers execute the office of Doctors, but Councels & Popes execute the office of a Judge committed to them by God* [a]. And again: *The Pope hath no Fathers in the Church, but all are his Sons: no wonder then that the Sons are subject to the Father, not the Fathers to the Sons* [b]. Thus *Gregory de Valentia* cuts the Knot he cannot untie: *If the consent of Doctors cannot be made out, the Pope may use his Authority* [c]. Really these Jesuites are most ingenious fellowes, they are resolved never to be at a non-plus: When they saw the Scripture was not for their turnes, they vote That should not be Judge of Controversies, and fled to the Fathers. When they saw multitudes of notable passages cited out of the Fathers destructive to their Hierarchy, then it must be Consent of the Fathers: Now because they know they cannot make out the Consent of the Fathers for any one Article of their Faith. here is a *Salvo* for that, the Popes Authority is evident; it is but saying, that is a first principle, and all controversies are at an end. By this time I think I may expect the Reader, that hath but a dram of Ingenuity in him, must needs acknowledg that the Authority of the Fathers is neither *ex veritate rei* (in truth) nor *ex opinione Pontificiorum* (in the judgment of the Papists) a solid foundation for a Papists Faith, which was the Proposition to be proved. I shall dismisse this with two Observations.

(a) *Augustinus & cæteri Patres in commentariis fungebantur officio Doctorum, ut Concilia & Pontifices funguntur officio Judicis à Deo sibi commisso. lib. 3. de verbo Dei c. 10.* (b) *Pontifex non habet ullos in Ecclesia Patres, sed omnes filios. Quid verò mirum est, si non pater filiis sed filii patri suo subjiciantur. Lib. 2. de Romano Pontifice c. 27.*

(c) *Si de doctorum consensu non aperte constaret, sua tunc constat Authoritas Pontifici. in Analysi lib. 8. c. 8. p. 119.*

1. How

1. How sweetly do the Romish Doctors agree in that which they acknowledge to be a principal foundation of Faith, *viz.* the Authority of the Fathers.

2. I shall leave this Syllogisme, taken out of their own Authors, to the consideration of the prudent Reader: *If you take away the authority of Fathers and Councels, all things in the Church are uncertain*, saith *Eccius*, as you saw before: but *Bellarmine*, and others, have here taken away the Authority of the Fathers: and in the next Chapter you shall see they take away the Authority of Councels: *Ergo*, there is nothing certain in the Romish Church. Thus I have shewed that the Faith of the Papists hath no sure ground or foundation in the Authority of the Pope, Scriptures, or Fathers: Now I come to the fourth particular, the Authority and Infallibility of the Church and Councels, which is the *sacra ancora*, the principal refuge of a languishing cause.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Authority and Infallibility of the Church and Councels.

Sect. 1. LEt us therefore examine in the next place, whether the Councels will stand them in better stead. Whether the splendid name and Authority of the Church be a solid and sufficient Foundation of Faith. In order to which I shall lay down this proposition. That the Authority of the Church and Councels is no sufficient Foundation for a Papists Faith. This I shall more fully discusse, because here it is that very many of the Popish Doctors do build their Hopes, and lay the foundation of their Faith. And here indeed they have greatest appearance of probability.

A *general Councel rightly congregated cannot erre in the faith* saith *Alphonsus de Castro.*[a] Councels represent the

(a) *Concilium generale vere congregatum non potest errare in fide, l.* 4. *adversus hæreses in verbo Concilium.*

Catholick Church which cannot erre, *& therefore they cannot erre*, saies *Eccius* and *Tapperus*(b). *The decrees of generall Councels have as much weight as the holy Gospel*, saith *Costerus* (c). *Councels approved and confirmed by the Pope cannot erre*, saies *Canus* (d) and *Bellar. Councels, being the highest Ecclesiastical Judicatories cannot erre*, saith *Tanerus* (f). *The decrees of Councels are the oracles of the holy Ghost*, saith *Stapleton* (g). Surely now I may cry out *Iœus*: Here is the ground and pillar of truth, and at least—*Spes altera Roma.*

§. 2. 1. Then I would know whence comes this infallibility of Councels? it must be from Gods promise (for they do not pretend it is any natural inherent property of any man or men single or conjunct.) And this promise must be made known to us by divine Revelation, *i. e.* either by Scripture or Tradition (for other Revelation they do not pretend to:) Thus far they and we are agreed: Now I assume, that the infallibility of Councels is not revealed to us, neither in the one nor in the other:

§. 3. 1. Not in the Traditions of the Fathers, for among all the Traditions mentioned by them, you shall not find this concerning the infallibility of Councels: Nor have our Adversaries (that I know of) alledged one considerable ancient Father, asserting that such a Tradition was conveyed to them from the Apostles; though had there been such a Tradition, they who were so careful to enumerate all the Traditions of far lesse consequence, which pretended to an Apostolical Original, neither should nor would have omitted to acquaint the Church with so important a Tradition, as this is now supposed to be: and this

(b) *Concilia repræsentant Ecclesiam Catholicam quæ errare non potest. Ergo etiam ipsa errare non possunt.* Eccius *in Enchir. c. 2.* Taper. *in Art. 1. Lovan. 9. 5.* (c) *Decreta Conciliorum generalium —— idem habent pondus & momentum, quod sancta Dei Evangelia. in Enchir. p. 46.*
(d) *Lib. 5. loc. com. c. 4.* (e) *Bel. de Conciliis —— lib. 2. c. 2.* (f) *In parte 3. Anat. Dem. 10. Sect. 202.* (g) *In Relect. Controv. q. 3. art. 4. p. 610.*

might

might suffice for Answer, till our Adversaries give us an instance for any such Tradition.

§. 4. But because Tradition and the Testimony of the Fathers is their chiefe Pillar of the Infallibility of Councels (the wiser sort of them being sensible of the impertinency of their Scripture-allegations,) I shall consider this a little more largely than at first I intended, and shall indeavour to make good four things, which if proved, will give a deadly stroke at the Root of infallibility. 1. If there were such a Tradition among the Fathers as is pretended, it is no solid and sufficient foundation for our Faith. 2. If the Antients did believe the infallibility of Councels, yet it doth not follow they believed it upon the account of such a Tradition. 3. It doth not appear that the Antients did believe the infallibility of Councels. 4. It doth appear that the Antients did believe the fallibility of Councels.

§. 5. The first proposition is this; That if some of the Fathers did tell us they had such a Tradition among them as is pretended, concerning the Infallibility of Councels, it is no solid and sufficient Foundation for our Faith, because the Fathers were subject to errours and mistakes, as we have now proved, and as the Papists confesse, at least they might erre in matters of fact (for in such things they acknowledge the Pope himself to be fallible. And this was purely a question of fact, whether such a Tradition were delivered to them. And that the Fathers were oftentimes deceived in the point of Traditions, and in matters of fact is acknowledged by several of the most learned Papists, and *Baronius* gives us divers examples of their mistakes in sundry parts of his *Annals*, and that too amongst the first Fathers, who had far greater opportunities to know the truth then their followers, and greater integrity to deliver nothing contrary to their knowledge, and much more mistakes there might

might be committed by those that came after them.

If it be said, That although some particular Fathers, might mistake in the matters of Tradition, yet the Fathers consenting therein are infallible.

This is already answered in the former Chapter, to which I shall here adde; that it is impossible for us at this distance to understand the consent of the Fathers, *e.g.* of the first or second Age, there being such a small and inconsiderable remnant left of them, like two or three planks after a common shipwrack. *Grigory de Valentia* confesseth even of the Doctours of the Age we live in, that *it seldome happens that we can sufficiently understand the opinion of all the Doctors that lived in one Age* (a). How much more hard, nay impossible must it needs be to understand the mind of that Age which is gone 1500 years agoe? And *Melchior Canus* confesseth, *That the Authority of most of the Holy* (Fathers,) *if a few did contradict them, will not afford a Divine solid Argument* (b). So that if such a Tradition had been delivered by some, yea the major part of the Fathers, if some others, though fewer had contradicted it, Faith hath lost its foundation, and this might be done (and such things in all probability were oft done) though no footsteps of it are come to the memory of Posterity. As *Austin* speaks of *Cyprian*, when he was pressed with his authority, he answers, *Happily he did recant, though we know it not: for neither were all things done among the Bishops at that time committed to writing, nor do we know all things that we committed to writing* (c)

(a) *Fatendum est verò accidere posse, ut quæ sit Doctorum omnium ejus tempore viventium de religione sententia, satis cognoscatur.* Lib. 8. Analys. cap. 8. p. 119. (b) *Plurium Sanctorum Authoritas, reliquis licet paucioribus rectè clamantibus, firma argumenta Theologo sufficere & præstare non valet.* Loc. Theol. lib. 7. cap. 3.

(c) *Fortasse factum sed nescimus. Neq; enim omnia quæ illo tempore inter Episcopos gesta sunt, memoriæ literisq; mandari potuerunt, aut omnia quæ mandata sunt, noscimus.* Lib. 2. con. Donat. cap. 4.

And

And if this was conſiderable in *Auſtins* dayes, who lived within two hundred yeares of thoſe times, how much more weighty muſt it be to us, that come twelve hundred years after him? Now then to put a caſe (becauſe this conſideration ſhakes the very pillars of Popery, and overthrows almoſt all their pretenſions from Tradition and the Authority of the Fathers,) ſuppoſe the major part of the Antient Fathers had ſaid *in terminis*, that the Biſhop of *Rome* was ſupreme head and infallible governour of the Church (though nothing was further from their thoughts) and ſuppoſe a leſſe number of the Fathers did in that Age contradict it, though the contradictours happily either did not commit their opinion to Writing, or if they did, their writings might be ſuppreſſed by the major part (as hath been the lot of moſt ages) or by the injury of time are loſt (which the Papiſts cannot ſay was impoſſible for the Writings of the Fathers, ſeeing they tell us that *de facto* ſome of the books of Holy Scripture are loſt:) the next Age comes and underſtands the truth of what I have now ſuppoſed: The queſtion is, Whether the Authority of the Major part of the Fathers of the former Age be a ſufficient foundation for their Faith in the Popes Supremacy and Infallibility? *Melchior Canus* ſaith No: Now then the next Age or ages having happily forgotten ſuch contradictions (which the Age immediately next remembred,) the queſtion is whether that Foundation, which was inſufficient to the precedent Age is now through their ignorance of ſuch contradiction become ſufficient to the following Age? if they affirme it, it would become the Jeſuites in point of gratitude to write a Panegyrick in praiſe of Ignorance, which is, it ſeems, not onely the Mother of Devotion, but of aſſurance and certainty of knowledge; if they deny it, they confeſſe the weakneſſe of their aſſertion: In ſhort, he that will lay the foundation of his

Faith

Faith upon such a quick-sand, must either prove the negative that there was no such contradiction as we have supposed (which is impossible) or confesse his Faith relies upon the Sand (which is dreadful.) And again, admit they had the consent of Fathers in this Tradition, I have given several instances, wherein they acknowledge they have departed from the consent of Fathers, and that there were several Doctrines which (if we believe the Papists, when they tell us the Fathers owned no Doctrine but what they had by Tradition) the Fathers received by Tradition, wherein they were *de facto* mistaken, and why might they not be mistaken in this? We all know how general the Millenary opinion was among the Fathers of the second and third Centuries, though it be said all came from the mistake of *Papias*, an honest but credulous Doctor: And dare these men venture their Souls upon it, that *Papias* was the onely credulous Author? and that this was the onely mistaken Tradition? or that it was impossible for those Fathers who were so many of them imposed upon by one credulous person in one point to be imposed upon by another in other points? All these, and many other uncertainties must not only be allowed, but are laid in the very foundation of infallibility

§. 6. The second particular is this: That if the Ancients did believe the infallibility of Councels, yet it doth not follow they believed it upon the account of such a Tradition, for they might believe it upon other grounds. It is evident they believed many (nay, to speak the truth of all) Doctrines, because they apprehended them to be contained in the Scriptures, and why might it not be so with this? Why might not the Fathers believe this (if they did believe it) upon the same misapprehensions and mistakes (which the Papists at this day run into) concerning the sence of those Scriptures which are alledged for the infallibility of Councels? And consequently

sequently the Fathers opinion of the Infallibility of Councels doth not argue that they received such a Tradition from the Apostles, but onely that this was their opinion; wherein, no lesse then in other points, they were subject to errors, as I have proved.

§. 7. The third Proposition is this: It doth not appear, that the ancient Fathers did believe the Infallibility of Councels. For trial hereof I shall refer my self to those Arguments and Authorities which are alledged for the proof of the contrary position. *Bel:* brings three argumēts to shew that the Antient Fathers held, that general councels could not erre, & not one of them speak to the point.

His first Argument is this: *They affirme that the sentence of a general Councel in the cause of Faith is the last judgment of the Church, from which there lies no appeale, & which cannot be made void or retracted. Hence it evidently followes that such Councels cannot erre, because else it were a very unjust thing to compell Christians that they should not appeal from that judgment which may be erroneous* [a]. I answer 1. St. *Austin* did hold that the sentence of a general Councel might be retracted, though not by private Christians, yet by a following general Councel, *former general Councels* (saith he) *are corrected by the latter*, of which more by and by, and that is enough to shew he did not believe it infallible. 2. The Consequence is weak and denied by the Protestant, and therefore might be denied by the Fathers: If the consequence be infirme now, it could not be strong then, and for this we have the testimony of a Papist, S. *Clara*, who tels us that *Calvin*, and *Robertus Baronius*, *and all the Protestants*, *and some others*, *who deny the Infallibility of a general Councel*, *do nevertheless acknowledge it to be the*

(a) *Affirmant primùm Concilii generalis sententiam esse in causa fidei ultimum Ecclesiæ judicium, à quo appellari non possit, quodque nullo modo irritari vel retractari queat. Hinc autem apertissimè constat ejusmodi Concilia non errare &c.* lib. 2. de Concil. auctor. c. 3.

supreme Judge of Controversies upon Earth, and that such a Councel hath a determining and decisive power, which all are externally bound to obey to prevent Schism. (a). Nor is it unjust, but necessary for the preservation of order and prevention of worse mischiefs, that there should be a supreme though fallible Authority, beyond which there might be no appeal: and as it is no injustice that there lies no appeal beyond the supreme Magistrate in civil affaires, though he be confessed to be fallible; so neither can it be any injustice, that there is no appeal beyond the supreme Ecclesiastical Judicatory in Church matters, though it be fallible, provided it be granted (which the Protestants with the Fathers do assert, and have proved) that such Judicatories do not bind the Conscience, but onely regulate the outward Acts, and prevent visible confusions.

§. 8. And the same answer will serve for *Bellarmine's* second argument, which is this: *the Fathers and Councels teach, that they which do not acquiesce in the sentence of generalCouncels are Hereticks, & deserve excommunication, and therefore they thought such Councels could not erre.*(b)

Answer 1. I deny the Consequence again for the now mentioned reason. The civil cutting off such as resist the sentence of the Magistrate, doth as fully prove the Magistrates infallibility, as the Ecclesiastical cutting off such as do not rest in the sentence of a Councel doth prove the Councels infallibility. 2. The Fathers did not account men Hereticks, meerly because they rested not in the sentence of a Councel as such, (for then they

(a) *Fatetur* Baronius *Concilium generale esse supremum in terris Controversiarum Judicem—determinativam & decisivam potestatem agnoscunt Adversarii, cui omnes exterius obtemperare tenentur, ne schisma fiat.* S. Clara *in system. fidei c.* 20. *num.* 14. & 15.

(b) *Docent Patres & Concilia esse hæreticos & excommunicandos omnes qui non acquiescunt Conciliis plenariis. Ex quo manifestè sequitur, eos putasse Concilia non errare.* Bellar. *ubi supra.*

should have been Hereticks for rejecting the *Arrian* Councels) but because the Doctrine which they opposed, and the Councels asserted was true; and so it was the verity of the Doctrine, not the Conciliarity (if you will pardon the word) of the sentence, by which they judged of Hereticks. That cannot be an Argument that the Fathers believed the infallibility of Councels, which is common to those that deny their Infallibility; but the calling of those Hereticks, who do not acquiesce in the sentence of Councels, is common to those that deny the infallibility of Councels; for the Protestants themselves have branded and censured, and sometimes put to death as Hereticks such men, as in Fundamental points of Religion have receded from their publick Confessions of Faith, and the decrees of their Synods, without ever pretending to infallibility.

But, that I may improve the Cardinals Argument for him to the highest, Put case the Fathers had said that men were bound to believe all the Assertions of their general Councel, yet this doth not evince that they thought them infallible: I prove it plainly thus. The Papists maintain that people are bound to believe their Pastours, and to receive all their Doctrines without examination or hæsitation, (according to that which *Stapleton* so largely and frequently defends, That Pastours are simply to be heard in all things) and yet they do not hold these Pastours to be infallible. So they tell us by vertue of that Text, *Matth.* 23. 2. the Jewes were bound to believe all the Doctrines publickly taught by the Scribes and Pharisees, and yet they do not hold that the particular Scribes and Pharisees (of whom the Text speaks) were infallible. And the Fathers might justly say all men were bound to believe all the decrees of their Councels which were then past, not that they thought Councels were infallible, but because they judged all their decrees

crees true and consonant to the Scripture: otherwise how little they valued the decrees of Councels, when they apprehended them repugnant to the holy Scripture, may be sufficiently understood by their contempt of the Arrian Councels.

3. There is in this Argument the same σοφισμα or error which runs through most of the Arguments and testimonies of the Fathers pretended in this cause, *viz.* they argue from the authority of Councels to their infallibility, and how invalid the consequence is appears from this undeniable argument. Masters, Magistrates, Parents, Bishops, and Provincial Councels, have Authority, but not infallibility. If all that the Fathers say to that purpose were put upon the Rack, it would prove nothing but this, that they thought (what the Protestants grant) that general Councels were the supreme Judicatories of the Church, from which was no appeal, and in which all men were obliged peaceably to acquiesce, but that doth not infer infallibility, as we have seen.

§. 9. *Bellarmine*'s third argument is this, *The Fathers teach, that the decrees of general Councels are Divine, and from the Spirit of God; from whence follows, that they were not subject to error.* [a] And this he confirmes by the testimony of *Constantine* (who, now he is Orthodox, is grown considerable, though when he was alledg'd against him, he was a greater Prince than Doctor, as we heard even now) *Greg. Nazianz. Cyril,* and *Leo,* who call the decrees of the Councel of *Nice* divine, and say they were ordered by the spirit of God: and so say I too. And it is true of all the decrees of all Councels, (nay of all the Sermons of Ministers) which are collected from Scripture &c

(a) *Patres docent esse divina & à Spiritu sancto edita decreta generalium Conciliorum. Ergo,* ubi suprà.

conformable to it (such as the *Nicene* Decrees were) that they are Divine Oracles. But then their Divinity, and that which is the consequent of Divinity, Infallibility, ariseth not from the Authority decreeing them, which being but humane, could not make the Decrees divine, but from the matter of the Decrees which was taken out of Scripture, as *Bellarmine* confesseth [a], and therefore divine. But if *Bellarmine* thinks from this particular case to draw a general Conclusion, I must make bold to stop him in his career, till he hath told me whether he thinks this Argument solid. The Fathers held the Decrees of the Councel of *Nice* to be divine, and (say it were) infallibly true: therefore they thought the Decrees of all Councels divine and infallible, and consequently the *Arri-Nicene* and *Arrian* Councels. If he can disgest this, I will say he hath a Stomach as good as his Conscience is bad.

§. 10. I think it is time to take my leave of the Cardinal, and come to the Friar S. *Clara*, (who being an ingenuous person, and coming last, hath doubtlesse selected the best weapons) and his great Argument I find to be this: That *the Fathers did generally own the infallibility of the Catholick Church, and consequently the infallibility of general Councels, which are the same with the Church, and their definitions are the Determinations of the Church*; this he largely prosecutes *cap.* 20, 21, 22. For answer, let me premise what I have proved, that if this were the opinion of the Fathers, yet seeing that they confesse themselves to be men subject to like passions and mistakes with others according to that of *Austin*, *neither do you think, that because we are Bishops, we are not liable to irregular motions, but rather let us conceive that we live dan-*

(a) *Concilium Nicænum cùm definivit Filium Patri esse ὁμόσιον conclusionem deduxit ex Scripturis. de Conciliis lib.* 2. *c.* 12.

geroush

gerouſly amongſt the ſnares of Temptations, becauſe we are men (a). And ſeeing the Papiſts confeſſe they have erred in many things, therefore this, if it were true, will afford no ſolid and ſufficient foundation for their faith; but I ſhall forgive them that infirmity. The argument (however he glories much in it) hath nothing ſound from head to foot; how can they expect this argument ſhould prevail with us, when it is rejected by themſelves, who deny the conſequence from the infallibility of the Church unto that of Councels. So doth *Camaracenſis*, as S. *Clara* notes, in theſe words: *A general Councel may erre in the faith, becauſe if it ſhould erre, yet it would remain that others without the Councel did not erre, and by conſequence that the faith of the Church did not faile* (b). The like ſaith *Panormitanus*: *A Councel may erre, as it hath erred; nor doth this hinder it, that Chriſt prayed for his Church that it might not erre, becauſe, although a general Councel repreſents the whole Church, yet in truth it is not the whole Church: — All the Faithful conſtitute that Church whoſe Head and Husband Chriſt is, and that is the Church which cannot erre* (c). The very ſame thing, and almoſt in the ſame words, ſaith *Antonius* (d), where he adds an inſtance, *That the ſaying of* Jerome *was preferred before the decree of a Councel.* Thus you ſee the conſequence is de-

(a) *Nec arbitreris ideo nobis non poſſe ſubrepere injuſtam commotionem, quia Epiſcopi ſumus, ſed potius cogitemus inter laqueos tentationum nos periculoſiſſimè vivere, quia homines ſumus. Epiſtola 75.*

(b) *Concilium generale poteſt contra fidem errare, quia ipſo ſic errante adhuc ſtaret aliquos extra Concilium non errare, & per conſequens fidem Eccleſiæ non deficere. art. 3. in quæſtione vesperiarum aſſert. 8.*

(c) *Concilium non poteſt errare, quia Chriſtus oravit pro Eccleſia ſua ut non deficeret: Quia dico, quod licèt Concilium generale repræſentet totam Eccleſiam univerſalem, non tamen eſt illa Eccleſia cujus caput & Sponſus eſt ipſe Chriſtus, & iſta eſt illa Eccleſia quæ errare non poteſt. ſuper part. 1. Decret fol. 142.*

(d) *In ſumma part. 3. tit. 22. c. 2. de Conciliis generalibus. fell. 6.*

nied by three Famous Authors of their own. Nay, what say you, if S. *Clara* himself deny the Consequence? I am greatly mistaken, if it doth not follow from hence, that he makes Councels infallible no further than they are afterwards received and owned by the Church, and allowes them to be fallible where that reception doth not follow, as we shall see hereafter; and therefore the infallibility is fixed in the Catholick Church, not in the Councel, and consequently the Church may be infallible, and yet the Councel remain fallible: as those Papists that assert Councels to have their infallibility from the Pope, (which *Bellarmine* and the Jesuites generally do) confesse Councels, without the Popes confirmation and in themselves, to be but fallible: for what the Popes confirmation is in *Bellarmine*'s opinion, that the Churches reception is in the judgment of S. *Clara*, and all the Authors he cites to that purpose. What say you further, if S. *Clara* confesse the falsehood of his own Conclusion? let the intelligent Reader judg. His Conclusion is, Therefore Councels are infallible in the judgment of the Fathers; and of all the Fathers he tels us St. *Austin* is the greatest Assertor of the infallibility of Councels: now I assume, S. *Austin* in the judgment of S. *Clara* held, that Councels are fallible. This I prove from his own words: *In this sense* Occham *rightly delivers the mind of* Austin; *whether they be Popes or others, whether they wrot any thing in Councel or out of Councel, the same judgment is to be passed upon them, that things are not therefore to be reputed infallibly true & certain because they wrot so, but only because they could prove it by Scriptures, or reason, or miracles, or the approbation of the Universal Church.* Thus far *Occham*. Now followes S. *Clara*'s exception; *which doctrine of his I judge most safe, and that it is owned by almost all Catholicks* (a).

(a) *Denique in hoc sensu bene dicit Occhamus de mente Augustini,*

The

The evidence of this place forced S. *Clara* to make this acknowledgment, that it seems to favour the opinion of those who asserted the Fallibility of Councels in lesser things, (though indeed this is but a figment of his own brain, and a distinction foisted into the Text, which St. *Austin* never dream'd of) and he is reduced to such straits, that he hath no other way to evade, but in stead of an Answer to oppose one Argument against another, *viz.* that it is sufficient for him, that the Fathers call those Hereticks, that do not adhere to the definitions of Councels, *Ergo* they thought them infallible: It is *Bellarmine*'s argument, and I have already answer'd it. And so this Block being removed, the Conclusion remaines firme, that St. *Austin* thought not Councels infallible. For farther confirmation whereof, I shall from hence collect two Arguments, plainly proving, that St. *Austin* was not of the judgment of the Romanists in this point of the infallibility of Councels.

1. Because no more infallibility is here granted to general Councels than to particular Synods, nay then to private Doctors. This I prove, because St. *Austin*, and the Papists themselves, and indeed all men allow each of them so far infallible, and their assertions to be infallibly true, as they can prove them by Scripture, or irrefragable reason, or miracles, or the approbation of the whole Church: and not one syllable more doth *Austin* give to general Councels.

---

quam ibi refert. 3. Dialog. tract. 1. lib. 3. c. 24. Sive fuerint summi Pontifices, sive alii, sive scripserint aliquid in Concilio generali, sive extra, consimile de iis judicium est habendum, ut in iis quæ scientiæ vel juris sunt, non ideo aliquid putetur certitudinaliter modo prædicto (scil. infallibilis) esse verum, quia ipsi ita scripserunt, nisi id vel per Scripturam divinam, vel rationes irrefragabiles, aut operationem miraculorum, aut per approbationem universalis Ecclesiæ persuadere voluerint. Sic Occham: Quam eius sententiam tutissimam æstimo, & ab omnibus ferè Catholicis amplexam. Systema. fidei c. 26 num. 2.

2. Be-

2 Because the Papists will not, and cannot according to their principles, truly speak what St. *Austin* there speaks, and therefore St. *Austin* did not think as they think (unlesse they will make him one of those, who seldome speak as they think.) It is the known and avowed Doctrine of the Romish Church, (however disowned by some of them, whom they look on as Extravagants and Schismaticks,) that we are bound to believe the Doctrine of the Pope, say some, of the Councel say others, of the Pope and Councel together say almost all, upon the credit of their own assertion, without any further reason. This is evident from *Stapleton* [a], *Gregory de Valentia* [b], *Tannerus* [c], and *Bellarmine* in several places, one I shall instance in. *It is one thing* (saith he) *to interpret a Law as a Doctor, (that requires learning) another thing to interpret it as a Judg, (that requires Authority:) a Doctor propounds not his opinion as necessary to be followed, farther than reason induceth us; but a Judge propounds his opinion with a necessity of following it. The Fathers expound Scripture as Doctors or Lawyers, but the Pope and Councels as Judges or Princes* [d]. And now let S. *Clara* himself judge, if he will deal candidly, whether St. *Austin* & *Bellarmine* were of a mind, or (which is all one) whether St. *Austin* did receive the Decrees of Councels as of Judges and Princes, barely upon the credit of their authority or assertion, as the Papists say he did, or onely

(a) *Contra Whitak. in variis locis.* (b) *Lib. 8. Anal. fid.* (c) *In Colloquio Ratisbonensi. sess. 9.* (d) *Aliud est interpretari legem more Doctoris, aliud more Judicis: ad explicationem more Doctoris requiritur eruditio, ad explicationem more Judicis requiritur authoritas. Doctor enim non proponit suam sententiam ut necessariò sequendam, sed solùm quatenus ratio suadet; at Judex proponit ut sequendum necessariò.—Augustinus & cæteri Patres in Commentariis fungebantur officio Doctorum, at Concilia & Pontifices funguntur officio Judicis. De verbi Dei interpretatione lib. 3. c. 10. versus finem.*

as Doctors, because they could prove what they say from Scripture or reason, as St. *Austin in terminis* asserts.

§. 11. But because it is of some concernment to understand *Austins* mind in this point, (whose authoritie is so venerable both to them and us, and whom both parties willingly admit for Umpire in this controversie) I shall further consider what *S. Clara* alledgeth from him for this purpose, The passage he pleads is this: *Untill that which was wholsomely believed, was confirmed, & all doubts removed by a general Councel* (a): *Therefore saith S. Clara it is not lawful to doubt after the definitions of Councels* (b). Put it into a Syllogism, and it is this. That which so confirms a Truth, as to remove all doubts, is infallible: but a general Councel so confirmes a truth, as to remove all doubts, *Ergo*. The Major is denied: for a private Minister may by the evidence of Scripture or Reason so confirm a truth, as to remove all doubt from the hearers, and yet is not therefore infallible. There are then two wayes, whereby doubts may be removed, 1. By the infallibility of the Authority: Thus when God tels me that which seems improbable to reason, this should remove all doubt. 2. By the evidence of Arguments, and so their argument proceeds *à genere ad speciem affirmativè*, thus a general Councel removeth doubts, *ergo* they do it by the infallibility of their Authority, it followeth not, for you see they may do it by the evidence of their argument. And this Answer might very well suffice: But that I may give them full satisfaction (if possibly the interest of these men would suffer their consciences to open their eyes) I shall prove that it was so, and that S. *Austin* speaks of this latter way of removing doubts, *i. e.* by their con-

(a) *Donec plenario totius orbis Concilio quod saluberrimè sentiebatur, etiam remotis dubitationibus firmaretur. lib. 2. con. Donatistas c. 7.*

(b) *Non licet igitur dubitare post definitiones Conciliares.*

vincing

vincing arguments, not by their infallible authority. This plainly appears by considering the contexture of the words: *Lest I should seem*, saith he, *onely to prove it by humane Arguments, because the obscurity of this question did in former times, before the schisme of* Donatus, *make great and worthy Bishops and Provincial Councels differ among themselves, untill by a general Councel, that which was wholsomely believed was confirmed, and all doubts removed, I shall bring out of the Gospel infallible arguments* (a). Where you plainly see, that he cals the Authority of Councels but a Humane argument and Authority, and that he acknowledgeth none but Scripture arguments to be *certa*, certain or infallible, as is evident from the Antithesis.

2. This appears most undeniably from a parallel place, where St. *Austin* speaks thus of *Cyprian*: *That holy man sufficiently shewed, that he would have changed his opinion, if any had demonstrated to him that Baptisme might be so given*, &c. (b) And a little after, he would have yielded to a general Councel, *if the truth of that question had in his time been evidenced, and declared, and confirmed by a generall Councel* (c). And he gives the reason of his yeilding, *Because that holy Soul would have yeilded even to one man declaring and demonstrating the Truth* (d), *—much more to*

(a) *Jam enim ne videar humanis argumentis id agere, quoniam quæstionis hujus obscuritas prioribus Ecclesiæ temporibus ante schisma Donati —patres Episcopos ita inter se compulit salvâ pace disceptare ac fluctuare, ut diu Conciliorum in suis quibusque regionibus diversa statuta ventilarentur, donec plenario totius orbis Concilio, quod saluberrimè sentiebatur, etiam remotis dubitationibus firmaretur, ex Evangelio profero certa documenta. l. 1. con. Donatum. c. 7.* (b) *Satis ostendit se facillimè correcturum fuisse sententiam suam, si quis demonstraret baptismum Christi sic dari posse.* Et paulò post. (c) *Si jam illo tempore quæstionis hujus veritas eliquata & declarata per plenarium Concilium solidaretur:* & postea. (d) *Quia profectò & uni verum dicenti & demonstranti posset facillimè consentire tam sancta anima. lib. 2. con. Don. c. 3.*

age-

a general Councel. In all which it is plain, that it was not any presumed infallibility of the Councel, but the clearnesse of the truth, and the strength of their arguments which would have satisfied *Cyprian* in S. *Austins* judgment. 3. This may be irrefragably proved from hence, that St. *Austin* makes this the peculiar property of the holy Scripture (by which it is distinguished from, and advanced above all the opinions, decrees, or writings of all Bishops in or out of Councels) that we may not doubt of any thing contained in it. The words are expresse, and brought in with a *Quis nescit: Who knowes not that the holy Scripture is so preferred before all the Letters of after-Bishops, that we may not so much as doubt or debate concerning any thing contained in them, whether it be true or no. But the Letters of the Bishops may be reproved by Councels, if they swerve from the truth; and Provincial Councels must yeild to General Councels, and former general Councels are oft corrected by the latter* (a): where there is a gradation from Bishops to Provincial, and thence to General Councels, but all of them are in this respect postposed to the Scripture, that we may lawfully doubt of any thing contained in their Decrees, and where they swerve from the truth, reject it. And nothing more evinceth the strength of this argument, than the sillinesse of our Adversaries evasions: *He speaks of questions of Fact and Ceremony, not of Faith*, saith *Bellarmine* and *Stapleton*, whereas the question there disputed was, whether persons Baptised by

(a) *Quis nesciat sanctam Scripturam—omnibus posteriorum Episcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari aut disceptari non possit, utrum verum vel certum sit, quicquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit. Episcoporum autem literas—per Concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in iis forte à veritate deviatum est: & concilia—per Provincias plenariorum Conciliorum authoritati cedere, & ipsa plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari. lib. 2. contra Donatistas c. 3.*

Hereticks

Hereticks should be rebaptized, which the Fathers formerly made, and the Papists now make a question of Faith. *But by* emendantur (saith *Stapleton*) *he means* perfectius explicantur. If you ask in what Dictionary or Author the word *emendantur* is so taken, you must understand that it followes *à majori ad minus*: that if our Romish Masters may coin new Articles of Faith, which diverse Papists professe they may, much more may they devise new significations of words. But I would know of these Doctors what they would think, or at least what discreet and sober men would think of that Author that should say, *Libri Mosis à Prophetis emendantur*, or *Scripta Prophetarum ab Apostolis emendantur*: and yet if *Stapletons* Lexicon may be used, it were an harmlesse expression. But if these men will give St. *Austin* leave to be the interpreter of his own words, he hath sufficiently open'd his mind, by making *emendare* and *reprehendere* parallel expressions, and by speaking of such an Emendation as follows after, or is conjoined with a doubting of the truth of what was delivered by the Councel. This may serve for the third Proposition.

§. 12. And here I might give my self a *supersedeas*, having shewed the imbecillity of their principal Proofs from the Fathers; but *ex abundanti* I shall adde the fourth Proposition, which is this; That it doth appear the Antients did believe the fallibility of Councels. The former proposition shewed, that they could not prove their Assertion, and this I hope will disprove it. But because what hath been already said may serve for that end also, I shall be the briefer in this, and shall only mention three arguments to prove it.

1, They who make Scripture proof necessary to command the beliefe of Doctrines or matters of Religion, do not hold the infallibility of Councels; but so did the Fathers: *Ergo*. The Major is evident from hence: because

cause one infallible Authority is sufficient, and the addition of another, though it may tend *ad melius esse*, yet it cannot be necessary *ad esse* (for then the former were not sufficient.) And the Papists, who believe the infallibility of Popes or Councels, do professe *eo nomine* that Scripture proof is not necessary, & that the Churches authority without Scripture-evidence is sufficient. When *Whitaker* urged the necessity of Scripture-proof to shew the Church, for proof of the Scriptures prerogative above the Church, *Stapleton* roundly answers, *that such proof is not necessary to a Christian man, and a believer.*[a] For the Minor, that the Fathers did judge Scripture-proof necessary, hath been already shewed, and will hereafter be made good; and to prevent tedious repetitions I shall now forbear it.

2. They who allow the people liberty of examination of all that any men, since the Apostles, say, do not believe the infallibility of Councels: but so do the Fathers. The major is evident from the confession and practice of our Adversaries, who believing the infallibity of the Pope or Councels, do enjoy the reception of their Decrees and injunctions without examination. *A Christian ought to receive the Churches doctrine without examination*, saith *Bellarmine* [b]. The Minor hath been proved from the expresse words of the Fathers.

3. They that derogate Faith from all men without exception, besides the Apostles, do not hold the infallibility of Councels: but so do the Fathers, *Ergo.* The Major needs no proof: for the Councels are made up of men, and such too as are confessed to be each of them

---

(a) *Homini Christiano & Catholico — hujusmodi probatio necessaria non est. De Author: Scripturæ lib. 3. c. 1. in fine.*

(b) *Debet Christianus sine examine recipere doctrinam Ecclesiæ. Bel. ubi supra.*

fallible

fallible: Nor do they pretend to any Enthusiasme, or immediate Revelation. The Minor also hath been fully proved: to which I shall adde one out of *Austin: If it be confirmed by authority of Scripture, we are to believe it without all doubting; but for other witnesses, or their testimonies, a man may believe, or not believe, as he apprehends what they say hath weight or not* (a). It is true, S. *Clara* sayes, that S. *Austin doth not onely prefer Scripture before particular Authors* (b): which, how false it is, sufficiently appears from the other testimony of *Austins*, which I have even now discussed, wherein you plainly saw in *Occam*'s and S. *Clara*'s own judgment, St. *Austin* positively took away all difference between Councels and private Doctors in this particular, and equally denied all *αυτονομια* to both of them. Thus I hope I have sufficiently proved what I undertook concerning the supposed Tradition and the testimonie of the Fathers, in reference to the infallibility of Councels. This is the first Branch; the infallibility of Councels is not made known to us by Tradition: the next Proposition must shew, That it is not revealed in Scripture.

§. 13. This therefore is the second Branch, That the infallibility of Councels hath no Foundation in Scripture.

1. I might justly insist upon what hath been already mentioned concerning the Doctrine of the Romanists about the insignificancy and insufficiency of the Scrip-

(a) *Si Divinarum Scripturarum —— pertinaci firmetur authoritate, sine ulla dubitatione credendum est. Aliis verò testibus vel testimoniis, quibus aliquid credendum esse fundetur, tibi credere vel non credere liceat, quantum ea momenti ad faciendam fidem habere vel non habere putaveris.* Epist. 112.

(b) *Dico Augustinum hic solùm præferre Scripturas particularibus authoribus.* System. 6d. ubi supra.

ture

ture to ground my faith without the Churches Authority. And surely they that profesſe they are not bound to believe the Divinity of Chriſt, were it not for the teſtimony and interpretation of the Church, *i.e.* the Pope, or a Councel (which is their aſſertion) muſt needs give us the ſame liberty to aſſert, that a Chriſtian is not bound to believe what the Scripture ſaith concerning the infallibility of the Pope or Councels, but for the teſtimony of the Pope and Councels, that is, we have no reaſon to believe their infallibility, but this, that they tell us they are infallible, we have their word for it; ſo it ſeems the Diſciple is better than his Maſter, and the Pope's word will go further than the word of God: for the Scriptures Teſtimony is not to be credited in its own cauſe, ſaith *Bellarmine* [a], as the Churches Teſtimony is. When the Papiſts would preſſe the Scripture to the ſervice of this notion, it may ſay to them, as *Jepthah* did to the Elders of Iſrael, *Jud.* 11.7. *Did not ye hate me, and expell me out of my mothers houſe, and why are you come unto me now, when ye are in diſtreſſe?* And upon condition they will reply with the Gileadites, *Therefore we turne againe to thee now that thou mayeſt be our head.* I will overlook that otherwiſe unpardonable fault, (by which they have rendred the Scripture unſerviceable to their purpoſe) and once more they ſhall have a fair tryal, whether the infallibility of Councels can be demonſtrated from Scripture.

§. 14. The firſt and principal ſupport of infallibility is 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. where the Church is called the *Pillar and ground of Truth.* This is the *Ajacis clypeus*, which you ſhall find uſed upon all occaſions, and infi-

(a) *Etiamſi Scriptura dicat libros Prophetarum & Apoſtolorum eſſe divinos, tamen non credam eſſe, niſi prius id credidero, Scripturam quæ hoc dicit, eſſe divinam. Nam in Alcorano Mahumetis paſſim legimus ipſum Alcoranum de cœlo à Deo miſſum.*

nitely

nitely repeated by every impertinent scribler of the Romish party.

For answer, to passe over that notion of our acute *Chillingworth*, that it is not the Church, but *Timothy*, who is there called the ground and pillar of Truth, and so there is onely an Ellipsis of the word ὤν, which is very frequent, στῦλος for ὢν στῦλος, or of the word ὢν στῦλος, for στῦλος ὤν, as the learned *Gataker* observes, and there are diverse instances of either of them. So the sence is, *that thou mightest behave thy selfe in the House of God, the Church, as a Pillar*, or as *becomes a Pillar*. And he gives this notable reason for it, because it was heterogeneous to call that Church a Pillar, which in the same verse he had called an House. And this I am sure would puzzle our Masters to answer. But to wave that, I answer

1. The Church spoken of is not the Church of *Rome*, but the Church in which *Timothy* was placed. And whether it be spoken of the Church in general or in particular, what is this to *Rome?* Here we find a notable piece of the Roman mystery of iniquity. If there be any Reproofs or Censures applied to any other Churches, there every Church must bear its own burden: but if any Church be honoured in Scripture with Commendations, Promises, Priviledges, That presently belongs to *Rome*, and they have a commission to seize it for their own use, but how unjustly, we shall here discover. For if you understand these words of the Catholick Church, or of the Church in general, then the words only prove the indefectibility of the whole Church, which may consist with the errour and Apostacy of several, which then were eminent Churches, whereof we have unquestionable instances in the glorious Churches of *Asia*, which notwithstanding this promise fell away: and consequently *Rome*, though then her faith was famous throughout the World, might fall with them or after them

them. And if you understand the words of a particular Church, they must be understood of that Church in which *Timothy* was placed. And if my memory fail me not exceedingly, that was not *Rome* but *Ephesus*, which notwithstanding this character did fall away. And moreover it was not the Church ruling, but the Church ruled, in and over which *Timothy* was set, which is here called the pillar and ground of Truth. And so the Argument runs thus: The Church and people of *Ephesus* are the pillar and ground of Truth: therefore the Pope of *Rome* is infallible. The consequence is thus proved: the Pope may interpret Scripture as he pleaseth, and though he may erre in the premises, as *Stapleton* confesseth (a), yet he is alwaies infallible in the conclusion, as the same *Stapleton* asserts: *Ergo* the Popes infallibitie is out of the reach of all Arguments.

2. The term of *Pillar* notes the Solidity, but not the infallibilitie of the Church; it notes the difficultie of its removal, but not the impossibilitie. Every stout Champion of Gods truth is a Pillar of the Truth, and such are frequently called by that name in the Fathers, but yet they are not infallible. *Athanasius* was a Pillar of the truth, but not infallible. The great *Osius* a Pillar of the truth, and *Nicene* Faith, yet fell foully, as appears by the story. *Musonius*, Bishop of *Neocaesarea*, is by *Basilius Caesariensis* invested with this very title of στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, (b) *Ergo* by the Romane Logick *Basil* thought him infallible, or if he did not, then *Basil* did not think those words implied infallibilitie. *Gregory Nyssen* tels us, *not only* Peter, *&* James, *and* John *are pillars, not only* John *Baptist is a Light, but also all that build up the Church are Pillars and lights* (c). Therefore it seems all Ministers are

(a) *In relectione Principiorum fidei. controv. 4. qu. 2.*
(b) *In Epist. 63.* (c) *In vita Mosis.*

infallible: Male-children are called στῦλοι οἴκων, the pillars of their Families, among the Greek Poets; and *Geta*, a faithful servant in *Terence*, is called *Columen Familiæ*, the pillar of the Family: For ought I know, if those men would go to *Rome*, and upon the credit of this word sue out a writ of priviledge, they might be as infallible as the Pope himself.

3. This Phrase, *The Church is the Pillar of Truth*, may note the Churches duty, not her practice, and what she ought to be, not what she alwaies is. They shall not say this is *gratis dictum*, I will make it good by parallel instances, wherein they shall see the absurdity of their argument. *Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evill*, Rom. 13. 3. If this argument be good, the Church is a Pillar, &c. she cannot erre, then this also is good, that Rulers cannot be a terror to good works. None but one that comes from Bedlam would assert the latter, & none but one that comes from *Rome* would conclude the former. Thus our Saviour saith of his Ministers, *Ye are the salt of the world, ye are the light of the world*, Math. 5. *Ergo* by this argument, this Salt could not loose its savour, and no Minister can be in the darke, but every one must be infallible. Thus *Prov.* 16. 10. *A Divine sentence is in the lips of the King, his mouth transgresseth not in judgment, Ergo* Kings are infallible. If the Pope had such a Text in the New Testament, *The Popes mouth transgresseth not in judgment*, you may easily imagine what triumphs the assertors of infallibility would have made, who can build a towring confidence upon such pittiful foundations: and yet this doth not informe us of the practice of Kings, but acquaints them with their duty, as interpreters agree.

4. This Phrase (the Pillar and ground of Truth) notes the necessity of the Churches ministry, *quoad nos*, but not the infallibility of her Authority: these are two distinct things, and the one no way consequent upon the other.

The

The utmost which can be squeez'd from that phrase is this, that the Church doth support the truth and Gospel of Christ in the world, and so doth every sincere, zealous defender of the truth, and especially the Ministers, and prime champions of the Truth, not onely when met together in a general Councel, but also in their single capacities, which I think will be undeniably proved by this Argument. *The Church was the pillar and ground of truth* for the first three hundred yeares after Christ and the Apostles, never did it more deserve that name, nor did it ever more discharge that office; but all that time there was no œcumenical Councel (and that is the onely Councel to whom infallibilitie is ascribed by the Papists) therefore either that Phrase doth not evince infallibilitie, or the several Pastors of those Ages were infallible.

5. The consequence of the argument is false and frivolous; The Church is the pillar of truth, *Ergo* she is infallible: for the same Church may be a pillar of truth & a seat of Error. For what is it to be a Pillar of the Truth, (if we draw aside the curtain of the Metaphor) but to be a *Defender of the Faith?* And who knows not that the same persons may defend the Truth and maintain errors with them, unlesse he be one that never read the Bible, nor Ecclesiastical Historie? Who knows not that the same persons, which defended the truth of Christianity against Jewes and Pagans, did also maintain the Doctrine of *Jesabel*, and the Heresie of the *Nicolaitans? Rev.* 2. and that those very men that owned the Foundation, did build the hay and stubble of false doctrines thereupon, 1 *Cor.* 3 and that diverse of the stoutest defenders of the truth of the Gospel among the Fathers had their errors, as *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth? Else, if they will stand to the consequence, it will follow by the virtue of it, such a Minister preacheth the truth, *Ergo* he is infallible, and cannot preach false doctrine. Such a Judg is the pillar of

justice in the land, *Ergo* it is impossible he should make an unjust decree. Proclamations are hanged upon such a Pillar, *Ergo* a Libel cannot be fastned there.

6. Their Argument proceeds from a declaration of the Churches present state, (for that is all that place asserts, *viz.* that the Church then was a Church and pillar of Truth) to an assurance of its perpetual continuance in that state, which is quite another thing. Which kind of argumentation, if it might passe for current, it would work brave exploits: for then it would follow, The citie of Sion was an *habitation of righteousnesse*, a pillar of truth and justice, *Ergo* the Prophet *Esay* was mis-inform'd, when he said, *The Faithful City is become an Harlot, it was full of judgment, righteousnesse lodged in it, but now murderers*, Isa. 1.21. Nay then the Church of *England* is Orthodox in the Roman sence. *Probatur.* It was the pillar of Truth, *viz.* when it was the Pope's Asse, *Ergo* it is so still, and the Papists slander us, when they say we are fallen away. The Church was a Virgin in the Apostles dayes, saith *Egesippus*, *Ergo* she is not now corrupted, nor indeed can be: For I must tell you, the Pope can do more than all the Apostles either pretended or did; for they could not even while they lived wholly keep the Church from actual corruption, but the Pope keeps her from all possibilitie of corruption. Thus the Pope is omnipotent, and it is no marvel he is infallible.

§. 15. The second place of principal moment alledged for the infallibilitie of the Church and Councels is *Matth.* 18. 17. where all are commanded to *hear the Church, and they that hear her not, are to be accounted as Heathens and Publicans*: *Ergo* the Church of *Rome* is infallible. For this is the comfort, whatever is in the premises, *Romes* infallibilitie is in the Conclusion, and the Church of *Rome*, that can dispence with God's lawes

lawes (a) may well dispence with Syllogistical rules, by which there ought not to be more *in the conclusion than in the premises*, but that Law was made for Subjects, but not for our Sovereign Lord the Pope. To this may be added another place they vehemently urge, *Luk.* 10. 16. *He that heareth you, heareth me, Ergo* the Church is infallible.

Ans. 1. Whatever these texts prove, what right hath the Church of *Rome* to her monopolie of the priviledges here conveyed? or why may not the Greek or English Churches and their Ministers claim the benefit of them? The words have an indifferent aspect to all of them.

2. The consequence is false. Christians must hear the Church and Ministers, *Ergo* they are infallible: which I thus prove. Children must obey their Parents, and if they do not, they must dye for it, Deut. 21. are Parents therefore infallible? Subjects must obey their Magistrates or dye for it, *Jos.* 1. 18. *Whosoever will not hearken unto thy words, he shall be put to death*: it seems then Magistrates are infallible. For this is the Argument by which the Romanists pretend to prove the infallibility of the High-Priest of the Jewes, because they that would not hear him, were to be put to death, *Deut.* 17. Nay this very text *Luk.* 10. destroyes that sense which the Romanists would fasten upon it: For seeing it is not the Apostles but seventy Disciples, & they too not as met in a Councel, but as preaching the Gospel severally, or (at most) by pairs, whom they are, under such dreadful penalties, commanded to hear, if it be conclusive for infallibilitie, it proves the infallibilitie of every Minister, or at least of every pair of them.

(a) *Secundum plenitudinem potestatis de jure supra jus possumus dispensare ait Innocent. 3. in decret. de concess. Præbend. tit. 8. c. proposuit. & addit Glossator, Nam contra Apostolum dispensat; item contra vetus Testamentum,*

3. It is agreed between them and us, that Christ speaks of the Censures of the Church *Mat.* 18. and therefore surely, if it prove the Churches infallibility in any thing, it must be in the matter there spoken of, *viz.* in Church-censures: But they grant the Church is Fallible in her censures, as depending upon Testimonie and matters of Fact: and therefore it is ridiculous to infer from thence her infallibility in other things which are not spoken of in this place.

4. The Church and Ministers are to be heard, not simply and in all things, but onely in the Lord, and what they speak, according to his words. This is denied by the Papists, who positively affert, that they are to be heard in all things, & without examination, as we have seen from their own words. It is therefore necessary to say something to overthrow this lawlesse liberty and boundlesse authority ascribed by them to the Church, for this is their πρῶτον ψεῦδος, or one of their radical mistakes.

1. That which Christ denies to the Apostles is not to be ascribed to the Church: But Christ denies this absolute Authority to the Apostles *Matth.* 23. 10. *Be ye not called Masters, for one is your master even Christ*, where it is not the Name, but Thing which is prohibited, even *magisterium fidei*, or the usurpation of an absolute authoritie in Teachers, and the exaction of an universal belief and blind obedience in hearers, which was the errour of the Pharisees here condemned by our Saviour, for so they said: *You are to believe all the sayings of our Rabbines in their Homilies no lesse than the Law of Moses*: And again, *all their words are the very words of God*, are their expressions in the *Thalmud*. It cannot be denied that Christ derogates that Authoritie from the Apostles, which he ascribes to himself; but if the popish opinion were true, the Apostles had as great Authority as Christ himselfe, for

for the height of Christs authority is expressed in these words (nor can more be said of God himself) *him shall ye hear in all things. Act.* 3. 22. This indeed the popish Doctors most blasphemously arrogate to themselves (as you have seen) but so did not the Apostles, they had not so learned Christ, they alwaies observed their distance: *Be followers of us as we are of Christ. I have received of the Lord that which I delivered.* St. *Paul* denies that he had dominion over their Faith, 2 *Cor.* 1: 24. *Not that we have dominion over your Faith.* Ile warrant you *Paul* denied it to himself, because it was *Peters* prerogative; for it is certain St. *Peters* Successors challenged it, for Dominion and Subjection are Relatives. And if the people owe an absolute subjection of their Faith to their Teachers, the Teachers have an absolute Dominion over the Faith of the people. In short, this sottish Doctrine of an implicit Faith must needs be Apocryphal, so long as the Epistle to the Galathians is canonical, and especially *Gal.* 1. 8. *Though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel—let him be accursed:* And he is not contented with a single assertion, but adds, *As we said before, so say I now again—let him be accursed:* Which if the Reader compare with that abominable passage of *Bellarmines, if the Pope should erre in commanding Vices and forbidding Virtues, the Church were bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be evil* (a), he will be able to judge whether the Faith of the present Romish Church be the same with that of the Apostles dayes, or not: and whether they who are so liberal in dispensing their Anathemas to all that differ from their sentiments, do not justly fall under the Anathema here denounced.

(a) *Si Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia & prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona & virtutes malas. De Romano Pontifice. lib.* 4. *cap.* 5 *in fine.*

2. If Pastours are to be heard in all things, then people cannot sin in obeying their Pastours, (else they should sin in doing their duty,) but people may sin in obeying their Pastours. Me thinks this should need no proof, but I find this to be the temper of our Adversaries, they who give the hardest measure to us, expect the highest measure from us, and they of whom we may say (as *Galen* did of *Moses*) *multa dicunt, nihil probant*, they say much, and prove nothing; will yeild us nothing, but what we must win by dint of Argument.

Therefore I shall prove it briefly. The Jewes sinned in following *Aarons* Doctrine: *these be thy Gods, O Israel.* So the Prophet *Jeremy* frequently condemns them for obeying the Decrees of their Priests in his time. And our Saviour hath put it out of doubt, speaking of the Jewish Teachers, *Math.* 15. *If the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the Ditch.* And St. *Peter* assures us, (if his Successors will please to give him credit) that the Jewes were guilty of a great sinne in Christs death, though they did it in obedience to the Decrees of their Rulers. *Acts* 3. 14, 17.

2. If people are allowed to examine the Doctrines of their Teachers by the Word ere they receive them, then they are not to be heard in all things: but people are allowed so to examine. — All the doubt lies about the Minor; and yet who can doubt of that, who ever read these following places. *Take heed that no man deceive you, for many shall come in my name*, Matth. 24. 4, 5. *Prove all things, hold fast that which is good*, 1 Thes. 5. 21. *Prove the Spirit*, 1 John 4. 1. It is true *Bellarmine* saith, *These precepts belong onely to Learned men* (a). And *Gretserus*

(a) *Prædicta mandata non ad omnes, sed ad solos Doctores pertinent, De verbi Dei interpretatione, lib.* 3. *c.* 10.

gives

gives this reason for it, *because the unlearned people are not able to examine*(a). Very good, it seems then, none but the Learned can *have their senses exercised to discern between good and evil, Heb* 5.14. And it is the priviledge of shepheards onely, which Christ made the Character of all his sheep, *that they know his voice, and could distinguish it from the voice of Strangers*, Joh. 10.4.5. It seems Christ spoke to the Learned onely, when he said, *Search the Scripture*, Joh.5.39. It seems the learned *Thessalonians* onely were bound to hold fast that which is good, for that goes with their proving, and proving was in order to holding fast. It seems the *Bereans*(whom *Paul* commends for examining his doctrine by the Scriptures, *Act.*17. were Masters of Arts, and *Berea* was an Universitie, and εὐγενέστεροι implies that they had Academical education: and the Apostle meant it onely of the Universitie, when he writ to the City of *Corinth*, *I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say*, 1 Cor.10.15. Nay, the mischief is, if this be granted, their work is not done: for if the learned may examine, that is sufficient for our purpose, for such are many Lay-men(as they are called,)and diverse of the Clergy, who have no share in the Churches government, and therefore are as much bound to subjection as any of the people: and consequently the Rulers are not simply to be obeyed, nor their doctrine blindly received upon their own credit. But (saith *Bellarmine*) *indeed doubtful doctrines are to be examined, but the doctrine of lawful Ministers is not doubtful, but openly good*(b). I see the Cardinal intended to shew his wisdom, reserving the

(a) *Cum peritia probandi omnes Spiritus superat vulgi captum, praeceptum hoc plebeis minimè dictum est.* Gretserus *in Defens.*

(b) *Agitur de Doctrinâ dubiâ, nam illa sola indiget probatione: Doctrina autem legitimorum propositorum non est dubia, sed apertè bona ubi supra.*

dis-

discovery of his Honesty to another time: *Bellarmine* was resolved to take a Post, which he might be sure to keep: he knew the Hereticks would be nibling about the premises, and therefore he leaves the guarding of them to others, and resolves to hold the Conclusion, (which he knew was not good manners to deny.) But if such doctrine as our teachers deliver be *eo nomine* evidently good and true, then these commands of trying are both dangerous (seeing they suppose and allow of doubts) and frustraneous, (since I may safely receive them without tryal.)

§. 16. A third place alledged for the infallibility of the Church and Councels is Joh. 16. 3. *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.* Hence *Bellarmine* thus argues: *Christ speaks not of the Apostles only, but of their Successors, because he saith, the Comforter shall abide with you for ever,* ch. 14. 16. *i.e. with them and their Successors for ever. But Christ doth not lead the Bishops severally considered into all truth, therefore he leads them into truth when they are gathered together; and seeing there is no greater Chair in the Church, by which God teacheth us, than the Pope, when a Councel is added to him, if his Chair should erre, how this promise is true,* [*he will teach you all truth,*] *I see not* [a]. That may be too: *Bernardus non vidit omnia,* and why should *Robertus* do it.

(a) *Alter locus est Joh. 16. Spiritus veritatis docebit vos omnem veritatem. Et ne putemus hoc dici solis Apostolis & non etiam successoribus. Cap. 14. apertè —— Dominus testatur Spiritum sanctum mansurum cum Apostolis in aternum, i. e. cum eis & cum successoribus perpetuò. Episcopos seorsim existentes non docet Spiritus sanctus omnem veritatem, ergo saltem Episcopos omnes in unum congregatos docebit omnem veritatem: & sanè cum non sit in Ecclesia major aliqua Cathedra, per quam Deus nos doceat, quàm summi Pontificis Cathedra, adjuncto consensu generalis Concilii, si hæc etiam Cathedra falli potest, cum universam Ecclesiam docet, nescio quomodo vera sit illa promissio, Docebit vos omnem veritatem. De Concil. authoritate, lib. 2. c. 2.*

Ans. 1. These words, if extended beyond the Apostles, do not imply any infallibility; or if they do, a man may with as great colour deduce the infallibility, nay the omniscience of all Believers, from 1 Joh. 2. 20. *Ye have an unction from the holy one, and ye know all things:* and v. 27. *the same anointing teacheth you all things. All Truth* in the text is onely meant of all truths necessary to salvation (nothing being more familiar in Scripture-use, than for general expressions, as *all men, every creature*, &c. tobe understood with tacit limitations) nor are all whom God leads into truth, infallibly led into it, unless they will make all sincere Christians infallible; for such are led by the Spirit into truth, but not all in the same manner and degree, as the Apostles were. So the Popish argument proceeds *à genere ad speciem affirmativè:* They are led into truth, *ergo* they are infallibly led.

2. There is nothing in that text *Joh.* 16. to shew the extent of that promise to the Apostles successors, which *Bellarmine* sufficiently discovers, by deserting this place and fetching in another to his aid *Joh.* 14. so his argument is cunningly patched up of two places. That God would lead them into all truth he proves from *Ioh.* 16. That God will do this for ever, he would fain prove from *Ioh.* 14. whereas this place doth not say, that *God would lead the Apostles into all truth for ever*, but onely *that the Spirit should abide with them for ever*, and that as a Comforter, which is quite another thing: if not, let me see that Papist that will give it under his hand, that every one with whom the Spirit abides as a Comforter, is infallible. And yet if I should wink at this fraudulent dealing of *Bellarmines*, and admit the phrase *for ever* into the principal Text, this would not infer a necessity of stretching this promise beyond the Apostles, partly, because in Scripture-use that phrase doth frequently denote the term of life, as *Exod.* 21. 6. *The servant is to be with his master for*

ever

ever, and 1 King. 12.7. —*they will be thy servants for ever*, and principally because in strictest propriety of speech the spirit of God did and doth for ever abide in the persons of the Apostles. As God *betroths* every one of his people to him *for ever*, Hos. 2.19. and is their portion for ever, *Psal.* 73.6. and the water that Christ gives to his people (which he himself expounds of the Spirit, *Joh.* 7.28, 39.) is in them for ever. *John* 4.14.

3. If this promise of *leading into all truth*, be understood of the Apostles and their Successors in the same manner, that is so as to make them both infallible, then as the Apostles severally considered were infallible, and not onely when combined in Councels, so also are their Successors each of them infallible, (which all Papists deny.) It is a strange way of arguing which *Bellarmine* useth. The Apostles severally considered were infallible by virtue of this promise, and their Successors are comprehended in this promise; and their Successors are not infallible in their single capacities, (as the Apostles were:) *Ergo* they are infallible when they are gather'd together. This is that I told you before, & here you see it exemplified, though Fallibilitie be in the premises, yet you shall be sure to meet with infallibilitie in the Conclusion.

4. If this promise of the Spirit did contain infallibilitie, and did extend beyond the Apostles, yet certainly it is a most unreasonable thing not only to communicate but appropriate this promise of the Spirit to such as have not the Spirit: such are all ungodly men, *Jude* verse 19. —*sensual, not having the Spirit.* Yea, in that very place which the Papists urge for the perpetual residence of Gods spirit in Popes and Bishops, *Joh.* 14. there is a positive exclusion of all ungodly men from any share therein, *vers.* 17. *The Spirit of Truth whom the World cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him.* A Character ascribed by God himself to all wicked men.

1 *John* 3.6 *Whosoever sinneth* (be he Christian, Minister, or Pope) *hath not seen him, neither known him.* So in this Argument they run upon a double absurditie. 1. That they denie the promised guidance of the Spirit unto those Elect, Holy, and humble Christians, who are the onely persons that in Scripture-account *have the Spirit, and are led by the Spirit, and walk after the Spirit.* 2. That they challenge the infallible guidance of the Spirit to those that have not so much as the general conduct of the Spirit which is common to all Christians.

5. That you may see the desperateneſſe of the Popish cause, you may observe, that *Bellarmine* himself elsewhere denies the conclusion, which in this place he strives to obtrude upon us: For here he inferres the infallibilitie of Councels but elsewhere he laies down this position. *That a general Councel may erre, and is not infallible, except the Pope confirmes them*; that is to say, The Councel in it self is Fallible, the Pope onely is infallible, of which more by and by: And thus according to *Bellarmines* opinion, the Bishops neither severally nor conjunctly are infallible, but in truth the Pope onely is infallible. And so *Bellarmine* hath not onely shuffled the Pope into the Text, but indeed justled out all others, and destroyed that infallibilitie of Councels which he pretended to assert; as became the Popes faithful servant to do. And so this is *Bellarmines* Argument from these words, God hath promised infallibilitie to lead all the Apostles, and all their Successors into all Truth, therefore none of the Apostles Successors are infallible save St. *Peters* onely.

§. 17. A fourth place for the infallibilitie of Councels is: *Acts* 15. 28. *For it seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things:* whence they thus argue: This Councel had the infallible direction of the Holy Ghost, and conse-

consequently all other Councels have it.

Answ. 1. If the Conclusion be universally true (which if it be not, it will do the Church of *Rome* no service) then the *Arrian* Councels were infallible: But if they say that onely the orthodox Councels are infallible, that alters the question, and the Church of *Rome* must first prove her Orthodoxy, and then her infallibilitie, and to speak truth, she may prove the one as soon as the other.

2. The utmost importance of this phrase is, that they made this Decree by the direction of the Holy Ghost. *It seemed good to us by the Direction of the Holy Ghost.* And for this there is no need to devise a new *Phænomenon* of infallible assistance to be afforded to all Councels (of which there is not one syllable in the whole Chapter) seeing there are other wayes, mentioned in that place, in respect whereof they had the Holy Ghosts direction, and might say *it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us*, and by which the Holy Ghost did give its Testimonie to their decree directed against those that urged the necessitie of Circumcision upon the Gentiles. 1. It seemed good to the holy Ghost in as much as when the Gospel was preached to the Gentiles by *Peter—God bare them witnesse giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us*, v. 8. so making no difference between the Circumcision and Uncircumcision. 2. It seemed good to the holy Ghost, who in the Scripture had foretold the conversion of the Uncircumcised Gentiles to the Faith, and their reception into the Church. And for as much as it is exceeding plain that the controversie was debated in that Councel principally if not solely by Scripture-Arguments, and the conclusion deduced from Scripture-evidence, they might very well say it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, it was conformable to the Scripture, there being nothing more familiar than this, that what is said in Scripture is ascribed to the Holy Ghost, as *Act.* 1. 26. *The holy Ghost spake by*

the

the mouth of David. Heb. 3. 7. *Wherefore as the holy Ghost saith, to day if you will hear his voice.*

3. If that phrase doth imply infallibility, yet the consequence doth not hold from Apostles to Bishops. I appeale to any Papist, (whose Candour is not gone with his conscience) whether this follow; A Councel wherein were several persons, even in their single capacities infallible, had infallible direction, when they were met together; *Ergo*, Those Councels, wherein there is not one person but is confessed in his single capacity to be fallible, are infallible: If any or every Apostle had singly said, *It seemed good to the holy Ghost and to me*, would this have inferred the Infallibility of every single Bishop? They say no: Then let them shew a reason why the Argument proceeds not as well from single Apostles to single Bishops, as from Apostles conjoined in Councel to Bishops conjoined.

4. There is also another inconsequence: The Apostles and Councel had the Direction of the Holy Ghost in a conclusion regulated by Scripture, and collected from it: *Ergo*, All following Councels have the direction of the Holy Ghost, and cannot erre in all their conclusions whatsoever: Is not this a goodly Argument? This Councel did not erre; *Ergo*, no other Councel can erre. The words are onely assertive of a present case, viz. of the direction of this Councel in that point, not at all promissive of any thing for the future, and therefore can give us no security at all for the infallibility of Councels for the future. It would make fine work if every assertion were turned into promise: I might as well argue, *David* was guided by the Spirit of God in the ordering of Gods house (as you read 1 *Chron.* 28. 12, 19.) therefore all succeeding Kings of *Judah* were infallible. Moses *was faithful in Gods house*, Heb. 3. 5. *Ergo* none of *Moses*'s Successors could be unfaithful.

Nothing

Nothing can be replied, but this; That *David* and *Moses* had a special assistance not communicated to all their Successors: And the same may as truly be said of this Councel and the Apostles here assembled; but (saith *Bellarmine*) *Infallibility being granted to this Councel as being necessary for the Conservation of the Church against Heresies, the same reason and necessity continuing the same Infallibility, must consequently be granted to following general Councels* (a). I answer.

1. If this Councel, by reason of the Apostles, was infallible, yet this infallibility was purely accidental (because persons endued with Infallibility for other ends were there present) and not conferred upon them for the decision of the present controversie: and the reason why infallibilitie was bestowed upon the Apostles was not common to all but particular to that age and season, *viz.* because they were to lay a solid foundation for, and to give a sure rule to all the Churches in after ages, and therefore infallibilitie was their peculiar priviledge. It is but a lame inference, Infallibilitie was necessary in the first Founders of Christianity, for the plantation and constitution of the Gospel-Church; *Ergo*, it was necessary for the constant and perpetual government of the Church in all after-ages. Upon the same warrant a man may argue thus: Miracles were necessary in the first erecting and laying the Foundation of the Church, *Ergo* they were necessary for the edification of the Church in all successive ages. In both cases the consequence is repugnant to common sence and reason, and confuted by Experience. For.

1. That such general Councels and their infallibilitie are not so necessary as the Papists would perswade us

(a) *De Concilijs lib. 2. cap. 2.*

plainly

plainly appears from hence, that God (who is never defective in necessaries) left his Church for three hundred years together wholly without them, and yet the Church since the dayes of the Apostles, never had more stability in the Faith, and a greater plenitude of every grace and good works than in those times.

5. That you may see how little reason there is, that Protestants should be convinced by this place, take notice that diverse of the Learned papists are unsatisfied with this Argument, among which are *Ockam* [a], *Cameracensis* [b], *Feron* [c], and Mr. *White* in his Treatise *De fide & Theologia*, where he thus answers the Argument: *Nor is it material that in that Apostolical Councel they use those words, (It seemed good to the holy Ghost and to us,) for first, it was a Councel of Prophets, in each of which Gods Spirit dwelt in a special manner, at least in the Apostles.*— And he addes—*If they acted with reason, doubtlesse they acted by the instinct of Gods Spirit, although not such as Divines feign to be assistant to Councels.* d

A fifth place they urge is *Mat.* 28. *vers.* the last, *I am with you alwaies to the end of the world.*

Answ. 1. Whatsoever this promise contains, the papists have no part in it, because it depends upon a condition which they have so grosly violated, *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and loe* (in so doing) *I am with you.* Christ commanded his Disciples to search the Scriptures; papists teach the

(a) Par. 3. Dialog. trac. 3. cap. 9. (b) Quæst. de resumpta tit. R. (c) In locum. (d) Neq; interest quod in Concilio Apostolico institutæ sunt eæ voces, Visum est Spiritui sancto & nobis. Inprimis enim erat Concilium Prophetarum in quorum singulis habitabat Spiritus sanctus speciali modo, saltem in Apostolis. Et paulo post: Si ex ratione agent, inambio ex instinctu Spiritus sancti, etsi non tali qualem singunt Theologi assistentem Conciliis. Tract. 2, Parag. 21.

contrary, Christ commanded all his Disciples that partook of the Bread to drink also of the Cup: Papists teach otherwise, and the like may be instanced in an hundred particulars.

2. Put this Argument into form, and it is this. They whom Christ promiseth to be with, are infallible; But Christ promiseth to be with his Church: *Ergo* the Church is infallible. Here are three Propositions, and every one of them faulty in one, kind or other. 1. For the *major*, it is most false: For Christ hath promised to be with every single sincere believer. *Joh.* 14. 23. *If a man love me—we will come to him, and make our abode with him.* So *John* 17. 20, 21, 22, 23. And the Holy Ghost (by which it is that Christ is present) is given to every such person: *Ergo* (it seems) they are infallible, 2. For the *Minor*, it is true, but impertinent. Christ hath promised to be with his Church and with his Ministers to the worlds end, but not in the same manner, and with the same degree of assistance as he was with the Apostles to give them infallible direction. If otherwise, then as every single Apostle was, so every single Minister must be infallible, which they themselves deny. 3. The conclusion, if granted, reacheth not to *Rome*: For there being several Churches pretending to this promise, and the Text no more determining it self to one than to the other, it may as well be claimed by the Greek or English as by the Romish Church: Nay, which is more, *Rome* excluded, or rather hath excluded her self from it, as we have seen, and by her disobedience to Christs command hath cut off her Title to his promise.

§. 19. There is one place more they use to plead it is *Mat.* 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* This I confesse drives the Naile home: I see they are resolved to make sure work. For now it matters not what becom-

of the Infallibilitie of the Pope or general Councels, or the Universal Church; For wherever there are but two or three Jesuites met together, pretending Christ's name, there is Infallibilitie. I think these Hereticks had better have held their Tongues, for then the Church of *Rome* would have been contented to assert the infallibilitie of Pope or Councels, but now they will not abate them an Ace, but will make it good in spight of Scripture, Fathers, and Councels, and all the World, that every Leash of popish Priests is infallible.

But I need say nothing more in answer to this ridiculous Argument, because the Answers to the last Argument will serve for this also: & their own great Doctors confesse the impertinencie of this allegation, and amongst them two great names, *Stapleton* (a) and *Gregory de Valentia* (b): And these are the Scriptures upon which they ground their monstrous conceit of the infallibilitie of Councels. What a sandy foundation they have for it in Tradition we shewed before, and how little countenance they have from Scripture, and how absurdly they wrest that to their own destruction hath been now discovered: and therefore I may conclude, this Doctrine hath no Footing in Scripture nor Tradition, which was the first branch of the Proposition to be proved.

§. 20. And here I might set up my rest: For having pulled down the two pillars, upon which the Building of infallibilitie stands, I know no remedie but it must fall to the ground. But for the more abundant demonstration of the ἀυτοκατάκριτος of the Romish Doctors, and vanitie of their Religion. I shall adde a second consideration, and shew, that however when they discourse with Protestants, they make a great noise about the Infallibi-

(a) *Con.6.q.3.art.4.* (b) *Tom.3.Disp.1.qu.1.punct.7.*

lity of Councels, yet when they debate the point among themselves, none deny it with greater seriousnesse, nor dispute against it with more earnestnesse than diverse of themselves. I speak not now of the private opinions of some obscure Doctors among them, but of the publick doctrines of the Church, the opinion of the Popes, Cardinals, and all the Jesuites, and stoutest Champions of the Romish Church, and the generality of Italian, Spanish, and Germane Papists, and almost all (some of the French faction excepted) do expresly deny the infallibilitie of Councels, and, which is more, they dispute against it; particularly *Cajetan*, and *Bellarmine*, and *Gregory de Valentia*, some of whose Arguments are these. *Infallibility is not in the headlesse body, therefore a Councel itself is not infallible. That from which there is appeal, is not infallible, but there lies an appeal from a Councel to the Pope.* Ergo *the Church is committed to* Peter, *not to a Councel.* Ergo. Thus *Cajetan* (a): *The Pope can either approve or reject the decrees of a Councel*, ergo *the Councel is not infallible. The Councel hath its infallibility from its conjunction with her head the Pope*, Ergo. *Many Councels have erred in decrees of Faith*, Ergo. Thus *Bellarmine*. (b) By the way remember, this is the Gentleman that even now urged *Joh.* 16. to prove that Councels did not erre, and now he proves they have erred: it were well if the Romanists had either better consciences, or better memories. *God doth nothing in vain, but the gift of infallibility would be given to Councels in vain, seeing the* Pope *hath it*; Ergo *That which is repugnant to our most assured Faith concerning the Popes primacy is not to be admitted, but the supreme and infallible authority of Councels is repugnant to it.*

(a) De *Authoritate Papæ & Concilii tract.* 1. *cap.* 6. & 8. & 11. & 12. (b) *De Authoritate Concilii cap.* 11.

Pope

Popes primacy, Ergo: thus *Gregory de Valentia* (a). So you see, by their own argument, either the Popes primacy or the Councels infallibilitie is lost: & as the Jesuites on the one side thus strenuously dispute down the infallibilitie and supremacie of councels, so their Adversaries on the other side do as stoutly overthrow the supremacy & infallibilitie of the Pope, wherein besides the positive testimonies of diverse of the most learned and antient papists, they have the suffrage of two late famous popish Councels, *Constance* and *Basil*, such a spirit of giddinesse and division hath God put among these builders of *Babel*. And yet this is the *Jerusalem*, a city united in it self; these are the men that reproach the protestant churches with their divisions in some petit controversies, whilst they themselves are so irreconcileably divided in that, upon which the decision of all other controversies depends, *viz.* in the rule and judge of controversies. I think I need not say much more. For the more antient papists, he that shall look into that excellent discourse of *Robert Baronius* against *Turnbull*, called *Apologia pro disputatione de formali objecto fidei*, will find the infallibilitie of Councels expresly denied by *Ockam*, *Cameracensis*, *Waldensis*, *Panormitanus*, *Antonius*, *Cusanus*, (all venerable names in the Romish church) whose words are there recited [b]. And for the modern papists, it may suffice to name three authors of principal account, whom the rest of the herd do follow. *Melchior Canus* laies down their doctrine in two propositions. 1. *A general Councel, which is not called and confirmed by the Pope, may erre in the Faith.* 2. *Provincial Councels, which are confirmed by the Pope, cannot erre, the rest may erre* [c]. And *Bellarmine* saith the same

(a) *Anal. fidei lib.* 8. *c.* 7.

(b) *Tract.* 5 *c.* 19. (c) *Concilium generale, quod non congregatum & confirmatum est authoritate Pontificis, potest in fide errare.*

thing almost in the same words (*a*), and when he was gravel'd with the authoritie of that famous Councel of *Chalcedon*, (a Councel that Pope *Gregory* the great said *he reverenced as one of the four Gospels*) and a Decree of theirs against the primacie of the Bishop of *Rome*, he answers roundly, that *that Decree is of no force, because it was made in the absence of the Popes Legates, who afterwards did protest against it* (b). Where by the way we may take notice, what opinion that œcumenical Councel had of the Popes supremacie and infallibilitie, who first passed and afterwards ratified that Decree, notwithstanding all the solicitations and protestations of the Romane Legate in the Popes name to the contrary. In like manner saith *Andradius*, *That Councel erred, in as much as it did rashly and without cause preferre the Church of Constantinople before that of Alexandria and Antioch.* (c) And *Gregory de Valentia* being assaulted with a Canon of the *Synodus Trullana*, defends himself with this answer: *That Synod is of no Authoritie, because its Canons were not confirmed by the Pope.* d

§. 21. It is true, the Papists perceiving the danger of their cause from this difference between the Pope and Councels, have at last found out this σοφὸν φάρμακον (and

---

errare. 2. Concilia Provincialia, quæ à Papa confirmantur, errare non possunt, reliqua autem possunt. loc. com. l. 5. c. 4.

(a) *De Conciliis. lib. 2. c. 11.*

(b) *Decretum illud magni quidem est Concilii, sed non legitimè factum, proinde nullius est roboris, vel authoritatis, quia factum est absentibus legatis Apostolicæ sedis & postea reclamantibus. De Pontif. lib. 2. c. 17. §. Quart.*

(c) *Erravit in eo, quòd temerè & nulla ratione Constantinopolitanam Ecclesiam Alexandrinæ & Antiochenæ duxerint præferendam. in defensa fidei lib. 1.*

(d) *Trullana Synodus nullius est authoritatis, quia non erant ejus Canones approbati à Pontifice Romano. In libro de Cælibatu. p. 861.*

by

by that means they pretend they are all agreed) the pope and Councel joining together are infallible. And in this sence their doctrine is true, that general councels are infallible, *viz.* if they are called and confirmed by the Pope. For answer whereunto I commend four things to the Readers observation.

1. Observe the nonsence of this Opinion. The question is, whether general councels lawfully called have an infallible assistance and guidance of the Spirit in the forming of their Decrees? The papists affirm, we deny: now comes in a condition in their affirmation, which overthrowes the affirmation it self. They are infallible (say they) if the Pope confirmes them; well then, the councel meets, considers, decrees, here is their work done, hitherto (say our Masters) they are fallible: they send them to the Pope for confirmation, for *ubi definit Concilium, incipit Papa*: if the Pope confirmes them, they are infallible; if he disapproves them, they are fallible. And so it seems the Councel receives infallible Direction from God for their work, after their work is done; and it ceaseth to be, before it be infallible, in spight of the old maxime of the Logicians, *Ab est tertii adjecti, ad est secundi adjecti valet consecutio.* Really the Councels have an hard bargain of it, that cannot get infallibilitie, till they have lost their Existency.

2. Observe the hypocrisie and self-conviction of this opinion. The infallibilitie of Councels is the great γλαῦκωμα cast before the eyes of those who cannot penetrate into the depth of things. Several Scriptures are pretended, which are said evidently to prove this infallibilitie: now we see they themselves deny the thing which they pretend to prove, & councels are infallible no farther then the pope pleaseth: & with this key you must open all the alledged Scriptures; you must bear the Church, *i. e.* unlesse the Pope shut up your Ears. Christ is present where

two or three are met together in his name, *viz.* if they have all the Popes approbation. The Spirit will lead you into all truth, *viz.* if you follow the instructions of his holinesse: and if a Councel say, *It seems good to the Holy Ghost and us*, it signifies nothing, if it be not added, *and to our Lord the Pope.* Thus Councels are meer cyphers, except the pope adde his figure, and councels are joined with popes, onely as *Bibulus* was with *Cæsar*, to fill up a vacancy, and make a noise in vulgar eares. Nor is the wound of the popish cause healed by this device, but only skinned over: For as the assertors of the infallibilitie of councels denie infallibilitie to the pope, further than he adheres to such councels; so the assertors of papal infallibilitie allow to Councels no infallibilitie, but what they have in dependance upon, and influence from the pope. So *Bellarmine* in terms saith, *Infallibility doth not come partly from the Pope, and partly from the councel, but wholly from the Pope* (a). And *Stapleton* is expresse: *The Pope receives no new power, nor authoritie, nor infallibilitie from the addition of a Councel* (b). What need I say more, such contemptuous thoughts hath *Bellarmine* of the infallibilitie of Councels, that he spends one entire chapter upon the proof of this proposition, *That generall Councels may erre, if they do not follow the Popes instruction, if they have not the Legates consent*; nay more, *if it be in a point wherein the Legates have no certain instructions from the Pope*: and he gives us among many instances of erring Councels this remarkable one; *The Councel of Basil by common consent, and with the Legates concurrence concluded, that a Councel is above the Pope, which certainly is now judged er-*

(a) *Tota firmitas Conciliorum legitimorum est à Pontifice, non partim à Pontifice, partim à Concilio. De Pontif. lib. 4. c. 3.*

(b) *Papa adjuncto Concilio nullam Potestatem, vel authoritatem, vel etiam certitudinem in judicando novam acquirit. in relect. con. 6. q. 3. art. 5.*

roneous (a). You see how hard it is for Councels to carry their dish even. By what hath been said, it appears what a sorry foundation the infallibilitie of Councels is, when from their principles it unavoidably followes, That a colledge of Jesuites is as infallible as a general councel: for they confesse a provincial Councel (which in it self hath no more Authoritie to oblige the whole church than such a Colledge) is infallible with the Popes concurrence, and without it general Councels are fallible.

3. Observe the insufficiencie of this evasion: For if infallibilitie were granted to such a combination of Pope and Councel, this gives them no relief, save onely during the Session of the Councel; for when the Councel is dissolved, their Writings must endure the same Fate with the writings of the Apostles, of being unable to judg or decide controversies: For all the Papists most vehemently plead for the necessity of a living Judg, that can hear both parties; and determine all emergent controversies. Thus infallibilitie is not so much as *res unius ætatis*, , nay oftentimes it is but *res unius anni*, like *Jonahs* gourd, it comes up in a night and withers in a night. And the Church for three hundred years after Christ had no infallibilitie, and since the Councel of Trent the Papists have not had an infallible Judge, and at this day their Church hath no infallibilitie, and consequently no solid Foundation for their Faith.

4. Observe the preposterousnesse of this opinion. If Councels come to the Pope for confirmation, he may say to them as *John* the *Baptist* said to Christ, *Mat.* 3. 14. *I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?*

(a) *Concilium Basiliense unà cum legato Pontificis communi consensu statuit Concilium esse supra Papam, quod rectè nunc judicatur erroneum. De Romano Pontifice l. 2. c. 11.*

So

So may the Pope say, I have need to be confirmed by your Authoritie, and without you am but *magni nominis umbra*, and do you come to me? But I confesse *manus manum fricat*. If the Pope have any infallibilitie, he had it from Councels, for Scripture ownes it not (as we have seen) and the particular Fathers could not give what they never had, and now it is good manners to requite them, and so he communicates to them that infallibilitie he receives from them.

To conclude this consideration: It is sufficient for my purpose, which is acknowledged by the greatest and most considerable part of the Romish Church at this day, That general Councels in themselves are not infallible, and consequently are no solid Foundation for a Papists Faith, which is all this Proposition pretended to make good, though you see I have given them an ἐπίμετρον.

§. 22. A third consideration is this: If the infallibilitie of general Councels rightly called, constituted and ordered, were granted, yet this would give no advantage to the Romish cause, nor securitie to their Faith, & that for such reasons as diverse of the most Learned Papists themselves do stamp with their approbation. And here I might insist upon sundry particulars, but I shall confine my self to a Few, and for the rest refer you onely to one of their own Authors. *White* in the oft mentioned Treatise, who thus breaths out his doubts concerning this Doctrine of the Infallibilitie of Councels: —*If you assert an unknown and invisible influence of Gods spirit, it is so uncertain and doubtful, that it is fruitlesse to contend about it. Seeing it is matter of strife rather than evidence to what Councels, and when, this assistance is given: whilest some quarrel with the calling, others the absence of Nations or Patriarchs, and others dispute about the præsidency, and others about the method and circumstances in the handling of questions: others about the number, weight or de-*

gree

gree of Suffrages, others about Confirmation, and others require the Churches Consent, ere it can be known whether this Assistance belong to the Councel, or no (a). Where you may observe no lesse than ten several causes of doubting, and yet all these uncertainties they will rather run upon, than acknowledge the Authoritie and Sufficiency of the holy Scriptures, which are called a *more sure word* (2 Pet. 1.19.) than that which had another kind and far higher degree of certainty than the Decrees of Councels can ever arrive at: but I must not rest in generals. I shall particularly acquaint you with some of the Intrigues of the Romish Church, and their own requisites to the legitimations of Councels. I shall pick out three. 1. They confesse the Councel which is infallible must be œcumenical. 2. And its Decrees must be ratified by the consent and approbation of the whole Church. 3. They must proceed sincerely, and faithfully, and piously in it. Now in all these things there are notorious defects in the Church and Councels of *Rome*.

§. 23. 1. Most Papists grant that, that Councel, to which infallibilitie is promised, must be general or œcumenical: and they that pretend to affert the infallibilitie of provincial Councels when confirmed by the Pope, do indeed utterly reject the infallibilitie of all Councels,

(a) *Sed si ad ignotum & invisibilem afflatum Spiritus Sancti religetur, evadit adeò incerta & dubia, ut siae fructu aliquo de ea certetur. Cum quibus Conciliis & quando hæc assistentia debeatur, altercationis, non evidentiæ plenum sit. His convocationem, illis Patriarcharum, aliis nationum absentiam calumniantibus: aliis de præsidentia disputantibus, aliis de methodo & circumstantiis agitandarum quæstionum; Aliis de suffragiorum numero, pondere, gradu; Aliis tandem de confirmatione decertantibus; Imo & consensum seu acceptationem Ecclesiæ per quietum usum & praxin efflagitantibus, ut scivi possit, utrum hæc assistentia Spiritus sancti sit Concilio debita necne. De Fide & Theologia, tract. 3. parag. 31.*

and

and ascribe it wholly to the Pope, and to Councels onely by participation from him, and dependance upon him. If then any Councels be infallible, they must be general: to which purpose they alledge the saying of S. *Austin*, *That those onely are* Concilia plenaria, *full and generall Councels, which are collected out of all the Christian world.* [a] Hence the seaventh Synod disowned the *Constantinopolitan* Councel, and their decrees against Images, *because they were not a general Councel, and had not all the Patriarchs there* [b]. And S. *Clara* cals it *The most received Doctrine of the Church*, and cites several Authors of great note to that purpose [c]. Now to assume: The Councels pretended by the Romanists were no general Councels. To say nothing of former Councels (which in their greatest plenitude were onely conventions of the Churches in the Roman Empire,) the latter Councels (on whom the weight of the popish cause principally depends) were not œcumenical Councels. There is one acknowledged defect in them all, to wit the absence of the Greek Church. Cardinal *Cusanus* complaines, *At present (Alas!) the Catholick Church, and the Parochial Church of Rome have but one Councel, seeing the whole Church is now reduced to one Patriarchate* [d]. And as the Objection is really unanswerable, so that which is offered instead of an Answer is very considerable, which *S. Clara* represents out of *Cusanus* and *Barlaam: That it matters*

(a) *Illa sola sunt Concilia plenaria, quæ fiunt ex universo orbe Christiano. lib. 2. de Bapt. cap. 3.* (b) *Quia sonus inditionis non exiit in omnem terram, & etiam quia non habebat omnes Patriarchas, nec eorum Delegatos.* (c) *In systemate fidei cap. 27. receptissimam hanc doctrinam num. 1.*

(d) *Hodie [prob dolor!] Catholicæ Ecclesiæ & Parochialis Romanæ sedis unum est Concilium, cum tota Ecclesia redacta sit ad illum tantùm Patriarchatum. lib. de Concordia 2. c. 35.*

not

not that onely the Romane Patriarch and those united to him are there, and the Schismatical Patriarchs are absent, for general Councels are not to be collected out of Hereticks and Schismaticks, but out of the Orthodox, and such as are united to the Church (a). From whence I gather two things. 1. That if the Church of *Rome* cannot assoile her self from the imputation of Herefie (which by the leaneneſſe of their replies to the inditements of Protestant Authors sufficiciently appears they are not able to doe) their Councels are constituted *ex indebita materia*, of undue materials, and therefore cannot pretend to infallibilitie, if there were any such thing *in rerum natura*. 2. That we are not to believe the Orthodoxy and much leſs the infallibilitie of Councels upon the credit of their naked assertion and absolute Authoritie, as the Papists affirme (seeing the most Heretical and Schismatical councels have ever asserted themselves to be Orthodox) but it is the right and priviledge of Subjects to examine and judge of the legitimateneſſe of Councels, and consequently of the validity of their decrees.

§. 24. The second particular is this: *That Councels are not infallible, nor their Decrees unquestionable, unleſſe they have the tacit consent and approbation of the whole Church.* This position is laid down by *S. Clara* (in the forementioned Treatise,) *there is required a tacit or interpretative ratification of the whole Church to compleat the definition of a Councel* (b). Nor is this his private opinion, but he there confirmes it from the words of *Pansermitanus*, *Turnbull*, Pope *Leo*, *Petrus à Soto*, *Castillo*, *Mi-*

(a) *Generalia enim Concilia non ex hæreticis & schismaticis, sed ex Orthodoxis & Ecclesia colligi debent.* Syllem fidei cap. 27. p. 301.

(b) *Ratificatio igitur nempe tacita vel interpretativa universalis Ecclesiæ requiritur ad complendam Concilii definitionem.* In syllem. fidei cap. 22.

randula,

randula, Gersonius, and others [a]. And afterwards he quotes these words out of *Petrus d' Aliaco*, *That general Councels may erre unless when they are accepted by the Universal Church, and then they are infallible* [b]. And in another place himself expresly tels us, *We are not presently to pronounce a thing* de fide, *by reason of some expressions of Councels or their Canons, but we must diligently enquire the constant judgment of the Church, else we shall find many Canons of Faith which do not agree with the Truth, according to the opinion of many* (c). And *Celotius* hath these words: *As we have seen before them common dissent of the Church hath rendred the Decrees of Popes and Councels invalid* (d). I mention this the more fully, because it is a pretty device. It must be confessed the Religion of *Rome* cannot easily be mistaken for a piece of piety, but he that shall deny it to be an Art of policy will quickly be confuted, and here is an instance will put him to silence.

There is a double discovery of the Romish subtilty in this businesse.

1. You see how handsomely they make a virtue of necessity: now they mannage it as a principle taken up

---

(a) *Idem in cap. 23. per totum.* (b) *Probabiliter respondent aliqui, quòd Concilium generale potest errare, & tamen quando & in quantum Concilia universalia acceptantur ab Ecclesia universali, infallibilitatem eis tribuunt.* Id. c. 26.

(c) *Non statim pronuntiandum quidvis esse de fide ex quibuslibet Canonum vel etiam Conciliorum loquendi formulis subinde apparentibus, sed constans Ecclesiæ judicium tam ibi quàm alibi diligenter expendendum est, alioquin multos fidei Canones numerabimus, qui veram doctrinam haud sapiunt, in multorum opinionibus.* Id. cap. 22.

(d) *Quemadmodum suprà vidimus, publicam reclamantis Ecclesiæ vocem Pontificum & Conciliorum decretis robur detraxisse.* De Hierarch. lib. 4 c. 12.

on

on choice, whereas *S. Clara* himſelf ſufficiently inſinuates that they were forced to it *ſe defendendo*, and took it up at a force put: for ſpeaking of the former rules of diſcerning a general Councel, he confeſſeth, *That their buſineſſe is very intricate, and liable to many troubleſome objections againſt the lawfulneſſe of their Councels, but here is a ſhort way to obviate thoſe difficulties, by arguing from the reception of the Church, for if the Church receive it for a general Councel, we need not trouble our ſelves about little matters, ſince this reception is ſufficient evidence.* [a]

2. Here is an excellent Antidote againſt the ſaucy Decrees of ſeveral Councels, repugnant to the Popes ſupreme Authoritie. If the ſixth Councel of Carthage be pleaded, that there ſhould be *no appeale to Rome from beyond the Seas*, if that of the Councel of *Chalcedon* be urged, wherein they give τα πρεσβεια, *the ſame honours and priviledges to the Biſhop of Conſtantinople, as to the Biſhop of Rome*; if the latter Councels of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* be alledged, wherein the Popes Subjection to Councels is poſitively determined: Now here is an Anſwer ready to this, and to all that former Councels ſaid, and to all that any Councel ſhall ever ſay to the Worlds end, *viz.* the canons of theſe Councels were not receiv'd by the whole Church, but oppoſed and rejected by the Church and Biſhop of *Rome*, a great and eminent part of it. Thus, I think, they have brought off their Maſter the Pope with honour, and as he was infallible, ſo now they have made

(a) *Cùm negotium ſit valdè perplexum, multi etiam multa objectare ſoleant —— quibus ea illegitima eſſe contendunt, in quibus non parum fatiſſunt nobis moleſtiæ: In his verò omnibus, hoc ſaltem modo multum diminuetur difficultas, arguendo à poſteriori ſcilicet ex ipſa receptione Eccleſiæ; utiq; ſi Eccleſia pro univerſali receperit, non erit opus ſcrupuloſius indagare minutiora, adeò ut hæc receptio nobis manifeſtet, quodnam concilium æſtimari debeat tale. ubi ſuprà c. 26.*

him

him invulnerable. Scripture cannot hurt him, for he hath the Key of Interpretation. Fathers cannot reach him, for they are his Children (saith *Bellarmine*,) as it is no newes for the Pope to be well stored with Children. And now Councels cannot touch him, for he will hinder their universal reception. Adde, if the Romish Doctors be beaten out of this conceit, it is but studying some new Device, which is easily done by men that want no wit, and have no conscience: for it is resolved to hold the Conclusion, though the poor premises may be put to hard shifts. Well then, to allow them their supposition, and all the benefits of it, they must remember the rule of the Lawyers, *Qui sentit commodum, debet sentire & onus*: Benefit and inconvenience must go together. And this is the inconvenience and mischief which they are still forced into, notwithstanding all their tricks and stratagems, even to eat their own words, and to pull down with one hand that infallibilitie which they build up with another. For how can the Councel or the Pope either be said to have that infallible guidance (which is pretended) in the making of their Decrees, if the Churches non-reception may prove their Fallibilitie? But here is the wonder-working power of the Church of Rome: do not think it strange, when you read that passage in the Councel of *Lateran*, delivered in an Oration before the Pope and Councel, *That the Pope hath a power above all power in heaven or earth*, [a]. For he can do that which the Schoolmen unanimously put out of the reach of every power in heaven or earth, *viz. factum infectum reddere*, recall things that are past, and by this Argument prove, that that Councel which was infalli-

(a) *In Papa omnem esse potestatem supra omnes potestates tam cœli quàm terræ dixit Stephanus Archiepiscopus Patracensis, in oratione in Concilio Lateranensi coram Leone 10.*

ble

ble while it sate, after its dissolution is become fallible. But to return: This is to precipitate themselves into those absurdities which they charge upon us. This is to make the Church judge of her Judges, this is to take away all the security of their Faith, if we may believe their own famous Councel of *Basil*, whose words are these: *Nor let any man presume to say, that a general Councel may erre, for if once this pernicious error were admitted, the whole Catholick Faith would stagger, and we should have nothing certain in the Church, for by the same reason that one may erre, the rest may erre also* (a). Besides hereby they run into a new Circle (as if all their former Circles were not sufficient.) If you ask what it is which makes the Faith of the Romish Church and people sure and infallible? it is the infallibilitie of the Pope and Councel. If you ask again what is it which makes the decrees of Pope and Councel infallible? It is the Churches reception of them: and yet all this, if granted, will not relieve them, for that the Decrees of their Popes and Councels have no such reception of the universal Church, appeares sufficiently from the publick dissent of so many famous and flourishing Churches in the World, I mean the Greek and Protestant Churches, which do not therefore cease to be members of the Catholick Church because the Papists disown them, no more than the popish Churches become true members by their pretending to that Title.

§. 25. 3. There is another assertion of the Papists: that Councels are not infallible, unlesse they be rightly consti-

(a) *Nec quisquam illud dicere præsumat. Quod aliquod generale concilium legitimè congregatum invalidum sit, aut errare posset, quia si hic pernitiosus error admitteretur, tota catholica fides vacillaret, nec aliquid certi in Ecclesia haberemus, quia, qua ratione potest errare unum, possunt errare & reliqua. in respons. synodali.*

tuted and ordered. For this, I shall deal with them, as the Apostles did with their Kinsmen the *Cretians*, I shall implead them with an εἶπεν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης. Nay, not one but many πολλοὶ κ' ἀγαθοὶ in their opinion. Councels (say they) may erre, if they do not procceed *Conciliariter*, *i. e.* in a regular manner, saith *S. Clara*, his words are these: *The most Learned* Corduba in Quæstionario lib. 4. qu. 1. (*quoting* Ruffensis *in his Prologue against* Luther *and* Horantius *in his places* l. 2. c. 17.) *saith, that God hath promised his assistance to a Councel, when they do what in them lies — If they be Bishops, and Learned and prudent men selected out of the whole Church, if they proceed without carnal affections, and with a love to the Truth, then, and not otherwise it is gathered lawfully, and in Christs name* (a). Thus *Bellarmine*, pressed with the Authoritie of the Councel of *Chalceden* against the Popes Supremacy, saith, *A lawful Councel may erre in those things wherein it acts not lawfully* (b). And *Petrus à Soto* (a man of great account amongst them) tels us this is the sence of their assertion, [That Councels cannot erre,] *They understand it* (saith he) *of Councels lawfully congregated, and acting without fraud and deceit* (c). And Pope *Leo* speaking of the causes of the errours of the Councel of *Ephesus*, assignes this, because *they did not proceed with*

(a) *Doctissimus Corduba in Quæstionario citans Ruffensem in Prologo contra Lutherum v eritate octava & Horantium in locis l. 2. c. 17. dicit Christum promisisse assistentiam Spiritus sancti, quando Concilium facit quod in se est —— si Episcopi & viri docti & prudentes ex tota Ecclesia, si sine affectione humana — sed affectu veritatis — tunc & non aliter est legitimè & in nomine Christi congregatum. in system. cap. 10.* (b) *Concilium legitimum potest errare in iis quæ non legitimè agit. de conciliis lib. 2. c. 7.* (c) *Cùm dicunt concilia non posse errare intelligunt legitimè congregata, & absq; fraude & dolo agentia, in defensione c. 74.*

pur

pure conscience and right judgment [a]. So *Maldonate* in his Treatise against the Synod of *Dort* saith, *In vain do Synods assemble, and men go to them, when they do not remove all sinister affection, and only seek that which is Christs*; and he addes, *Then indeed they are gathered together in Christs name, then Christ is in the midst of them* [b]. The summe is this: Infallible assistance is not a gift dispensed promiscuously to Pope or Bishops, howsoever they demean themselves; but onely upon their good behaviour, being the priviledge of those alone who act with diligence, fidelity, sincere love to the truth and good conscience; that is to say, to such persons as few Popes and popish Bishops have been. So that if any Popes or Bishops violate the conditions on their parts required, they may lose the priviledge on Gods part promised: if they be unsincere in their intentions, and biassed with humane affection, if ambition or covetousnesse be in their hearts and sway their actions, *actum est de infallibilitate*, their infallibility is laid in the dust. It is true S. *Clara* saith, *We are to suppose that a Pope and Councel do thus proceed, unlesse the contrary be evident* [c]. But I answer,

1. Thus the Doctrine of Infallibilitie, and the whole weight of the Romish Church and cause depends upon a meer supposition, and (which is far worse) upon such an one as can never be proved: for who can know the sincerity of another mans intentions but himself? *What man knoweth the things of a man, save the Spirit of a man that is in him?* 1 Cor. 2.

(a) *Eo quod non pura conscientia & recto judicio secundùm consuetudinem, hi qui collecti sunt, de fide & erratibus protulerunt.* in Epist. 24.

(b) *Frustrà Synodi coeunt, frustrà ad eas itur, quando non omni effectu sequiori remoto, solùm id quaritur quod Christi est* —— *Tum demum in nomine Christi—congregantur, tum demum is medio eorum est Christus.* In *Antisynodico.* (c) *Supponendum quod semper sic procedat, nisi constet de oppositio.* System. c. 20.

2. I note that these men craftily shift off the proof to us when it belongs to them, *asserenti incumbit probatio.* He that saith a Pope or Councel proceeding sincerely and piously is infallible, is bound to prove two things. 1. That such an one is a lawful Pope or Councel. 2. That such a lawful Pope or Councel proceeds lawfully (as *Bellarmine* himself requires) and piously: And as it were an absurd conceit, if I require a proof that such a man is lawful Pope: to say *supponendum est*, &c, we must suppose him to be the Lawful Pope, unlesse the contrary be evident; so it is also when I expect a proof of the sincerity of his intentions, instead of a *probandum*, to tell me *supponendum est*, which is to tell me that I must venture my salvation upon a proofelesse assertion: And it is a new strain of popish Logick that Suppositions must passe for Arguments. 3. I observe the desperate issue of popish principles, the foundation of their Faith and Hope is the infallibility of Pope or Councel: This infallibility they can have no assurance of; which I thus prove. No man can have assurance of the performance of a Conditional promise, unlesse he have assurance of the performance of the condition; but the promise of Infallibility is a conditional promise depending upon the honesty and sincerity of a mans intentions, which another man can never be assured of. Here we have a remarkable evidence of the perverse spirit of our Adversaries, and the indefensibleness of their cause. Those very men that are so curious and critical, that they will not allow a man to be sure of his own sincerity, now will needs have us to rest assured of the sincerity of another man. But how are we assured? Why, with a *non constat de opposito*: an ingenious device, which will serve for many excellent purposes. Thus I may be assured that the present great *Mogul* is turned Christian, because the contrary is not evident. Thus I may be assured

red of the vertue, wiſdome, and piety of every perſon that now lives at *Rome*, becauſe the contrary is not evident to me. In a word, according to their Doctrines and Anſwers, a Papiſt hath no greater aſſurance of the Popes or Councels infallibilitie, than I have *That there is a World in the Moon, that the day of judgment ſhall be next year, or that I ſhall die to morrow, or that a thouſand ſouls ſhall be converted by the next Sermon I preach*, becauſe in all theſe I may ſay *non conſtat de oppoſito*, the contrary is not evident. Really the Proteſtants ought not to be envious at the aſſurance of the Papiſts, for they are contented with very moderate termes for it. If they would be ſatisfied with the ſame kind of aſſurance in conveyance of worldly eſtates as they are in the Salvation of their Soules, I believe they would get away all good bargaines from their neighbours, but you will find them wiſer there.

4. But alas for them, I fear I ſhall be cruel to them, for I cannot allow their *non conſtat de oppoſito*. They tell us we muſt ſuppoſe that Popes and Councels have alwaies acted ſincerely and honeſtly, becauſe we do not know the contrary: an aſſertion, which whoſoever will undertake to make good, muſt combate the Faith of all Hiſtory. I ſhall ſay nothing of the cenſures of proteſtants upon them (whoſe intereſt and opinion may render them ſuſpected of partiality: But I hope they will not take it amiſſe if I repreſent ſome few of the innumerable Teſtimonies which their own moſt learned and approved Authors have given coucerning the hypocriſie, impiety, fraud, ambition, avarice of their infallible Gentlemen, the Popes and popiſh Biſhops. And were it not that the Pope hath a power of turning vice into virtue at his pleaſure (according to that ſaying of *Bellarmine*, *In a good ſence Chriſt hath given to* Peter *a power of making*

sin to be no sin, (a) it were impossible to mistake the Pope for a Saint. Let us hear some few of the expressions of such as lived and died in their communion. For the Popes, he that reads their own Historians, would think the name of *Holiness* were given to them by Antiphrasis, and that in meer pity they were allowed the name, who did not pretend to the thing. The papal chair is called by themselves *cathedra pestilentiæ*, a pestilential chaire. *Genebrard* himself, though a sworn Vassal of the Popes, confesseth, as I observed before, that for 150 years together the Popes were *Apostatici*, Apostates, not Apostolicks, as if they succeeded *Peter* onely in the denying of his Master; and yet these are our infallible masters. Who doubts but they can work Miracles at *Rome*, that can make Apostacie and Infallibilitie dwell together in the same person? and however our Saviour said, *No man can serve two Masters*, and St. *Paul*, *What communion can there be between Christ and Belial*, yet the Papists are infallibly sure of the contrary, (for if their most approved Authors may be credited) diverse of the Popes have had infallible guidance of God's spirit, and undoubted communion with the Devil at the same time. For so saith *Platina* (sometimes the Popes Library keeper,) *All the Popes from Sylvester the second, even to Gregory the seventh inclusively* (which were about 18 popes) *were Magicians.* (b) But I confesse all the Popes were not Conjurers, for some of them were such silly wretches, that they did not understand Grammer, according to the report

(a) *In bono sensu dedit Christus Petro potestatem faciendi de peccato non peccatum. con. Barcl. c. 31. Vide quæ suprà allegavimus.*

(b) *Omnes Papæ à Sylvestro secundo ad Gregorium septimum inclusivè fuerunt Magi. Platina.*

of

of their own Authors [a]; And yet these two were infallible Doctors. And *Ludovicus Vives* dealt too hardly with poor *Dullardus* for saying, *The better Grammarian, the worse Divine*; for here, it seems, the worst Grammarians were the best, nay the infallible Divines. All Histories are full of the ambition, frauds, forgeries, even of those who were accounted some of the best of their Popes, to say nothing of more abominable vices: nor did this corruption rest in the head, but from thence dispersd it self into all the members, the Cardinals, Bishops, Governours of the Romish Church. It was acknowledged by the Pope (and therefore infallibly true) *Adrianus* the sixth, by the name of the Popes and prelates, *We have all turned after our own wayes, there is none that doth good no not one.* [b] The famous Chancellour of *Paris*, *Gerson*, complaines that *Learned and godly Bishops where chosen no where, but carnal men, and ignorant of Spiritual things* [c]. *And so proud* (saith he) *that they do not know themselves to be men. Duarenus* speaks home to this purpose: *Most of the Bishops of our time are greater strangers to Religion and holy things than any of the Secular Nobles, and they mind nothing but how to defend their possessions by right or wrong* [d]. *Ferus* cries out, *who doth not see their insatiable*

---

a *Cùm constet plures Papas adeo illiteratos esse ut Grammaticam penitus ignorent, quî fit ut sacras literas interpretari possint. Alphonsus de Castro con. Hæreses c. 4 in editione An.* 1543.

b *Omnes nos declinavimus unusquisque in vias suas, nec fuit jamdiu qui faceret bonum, non fuit usque ad unum. In institutionibus ad legatos Norinbergæ, anno* 1525. c *Nullibi Episcopos bonos & opere ac Doctrina probatos eligi, sed homines carnales & spiritualium ignaros—— Prælatos adeo superbos esse ut homines se nesciant. In declaratione defectuum Ecclesiast.* d *Plerique Episcopi nostro tempore à religione & sacris, quam quosvis satrapas & Principes profanos longè alieniores, nec aliud eis curæ esse, quàm ut ditiones & possessiones suas quo jure, quâve injuria tueantur. De sacro ministerio lib.* 1. *c.* 4.

avarice and impostures of the Popes and religious men? with these all things are vendible [a]. And *Stella* informes us, *there were few possessors of Benefices who had them otherwise than either by begging or paying for them.* [b] And yet these were the good men of the Church of *Rome*, these are they who acted in Councels sincerely from love to God and his truth, not seeking their own things but the things of Christ, and therefore without doubt infallible. And for the state of Councels, take one testimonie for all, of one that was an eminent part and member of them, Cardinal *Julian*, who in his Epistle to *Eugenius* the fourth in the Councel of *Basil* in plain terms tels him, that *all Councels, since that of Chalcedon,* (which was above a thousand years ago) *were instituted, not for the discovery of Truth, but for the defence and increase of the power of the Roman Church, and the libertie of Churchmen.* [c]

Should I descend to particulars, and open the several impostures and palpable Frauds, which the Popes and their partisans have successively used in the packing of Councels, and making voices, and forging decrees, and ingaging the Bishops by hopes, and fears, and interests, to give up their votes and consciences to the advancement of the Romish power and magnificence, I should engage my self to transcribe whole volumes, and cut out work for the whole terme of my life. The Transactions of the Councel of *Trent* are fresh in memory: And he that shall peruse the words of their own Historians, the Pro-

---

(a) *Quis sacerdotum ac Religiosorum & Pontificum inexplebilem avaritiam & impostur as non videt? apud hos omnia venalia sunt. in Joh.* 2.

(b) *Pauci sunt Beneficiarii nisi aut prece aut pretio. in Luc.* 21.

(c) *Omnia Concilia post Chalcedonense potissimum instituta fuerunt, non ut erueretur veritas, sed ut roboraretur, defenderetur, atque augeretur semper Ecclesiæ Romanæ potestas, & Ecclesiasticorum libertas. Æneas Sylvius lib.* 2. *de gestis concil. Basil.*

testations

teſtations of Princes, the Cenſures of Univerſities relating to it &c. will eaſily be ſatisfied, whether *Clara's non conſtat de oppoſito* be true or no. And therefore notwithſtanding this frivolous excuſe it remains a truth, that according to the principles of papiſts themſelves, and becauſe of thoſe evident defects in them acknowledged by their own Authors, whatever Councels regularly called and ordered may pretend to, their Councels muſt lay down their claime to infallibility, and ſo their Faith hath no ſolid Foundation, as not in the Pope's authority, ſo not in Scripture, nor in the teſtimonie of the Fathers, nor yet in the infallibility of general Councels. And therefore I may ſafely conclude, they have no ſolid Foundation for their Faith.

26. There is only one thing which may ſeem to retard the paſſing of the ſentence: that is this. That although each of theſe taken aſunder may not be ſufficient, yet all put together make a Cord which is not eaſily broken, *Quæ non proſunt ſingula, juncta juvant*: and therefore forasmuch as the Church ſtands upon four pillars, Authority of Scriptures, Tradition of Fathers, infallibility of Councels, and the Pope, their Faith is like Mount Sion that cannot be removed. And if it be deemed an abſurd and unreaſonable thing (as we poor fallible creatures have thought) to prove the Scriptures from the Authority of the Church, Councels, or Pope, and circularly to prove the authority of the Church, Councels, or Pope from the Scripture; the Jeſuites have found out the Quadrature of the Circle, and they tell you, that it is no more abſurd that Scripture ſhould lean upon the Churches authority, and the Church on the authoritie of Scripture, than that S. *John* the Baptiſt ſhould give teſtimonie to Chriſt, and Chriſt to him again; or that the Old Teſtament ſhould be confirmed by the New, and the New Teſtament by the Old. This is one of their laſt pleas: We find them now retired

retired to their Fort-royal, beat them out of this, and upon the matter all is lost: and truely that will be no hard matter to do, if the Reader please to consider. 1. The great disparity of the alledged instances. *John* and *Christ* might give testimony one to another, but neither of them did simply depend upon each others testimonies. Supposing that Christ had given no expresse testimonie concerning *John*, yet I say the mission of *John* was not only true in it self, but sufficiently evident to the Jews, as plainly appears from hence: That the Pharisees, when asked by Christ, whether the Baptisme of *John* was from Heaven or of men, were afraid to deny its Heavenly original, as being against the common sentiment of the Jewes: and Christ chargeth the Pharisees with *rejecting the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of John*, Luk. 7. 30 And much more true it is of Christ, that he did not depend upon the testimonie of *John*, but had other and better testimonie, *John* 5. 36. *But I have greater testimony than that of John.* And it is enough for my purpose, if either *Christ* or *John* had an authority independent upon the others evidence, though the other had not. And the like may be said of the Old and New Testament: well may they give testimonie one to another, for neither of them doth totally depend upon the other. The old Testament did sufficiently evidence its authority, before ever the New Testament was written; and the New Testament too did carry other convincing evidences of its divine original and authoritie, besides the testimonie of the Old Testament: such as the voice from Heaven, *This is my beloved Son*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 17. and the glorious miracles he did, *Joh.* 5. 36. *The works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me*: the holinesse of his life, power of his doctrine, patience of his death. But now (to apply this to our present purpose) it is here far otherwise: for the Scripture (say they) doth not evidence it

self

self any other way to us but by the Churches testimony, (as we have heard from their own words) and Councels, Fathers, and the Pope (we say, and have proved) cannot evidence their Authoritie and Infallibilitie any other way but by the Scriptures, (which according to their principles is impossible) or by their own testimonie, which is ridiculous.

2. Let it be considered, that the Romanists do not make these four, Scripture, Fathers, Councels, and Popes coordinate and collateral foundations of their Faith, as if each of them did contribute a distinct and independent support unto the Romish Faith; but indeed they make one of them totally to depend upon another, and at last reduce them all to one, and (to speak properly) to none. For the Fathers, and Councels, and the splendid name of the Church, however they are pretended to put a fair glosse upon a foul cause, yet indeed the authority of them all is as vigorously disputed against by the most and learnedest Romanists, as by any Protestants in the world. You remember, what their great master *Bellarmine* told you, *That infallibility and supreme Authority is not partly in the Pope, partly in the Councel, but wholly in the Pope*: what need we trouble our selves further? Those four are now reduc'd to two, Scripture and the Pope; and those two must mutually prove one another. There is no solid and sufficient ground for me to believe the Scriptures, but the testimonie of the Pope, say the Papists; and there is no solid and sufficient ground for me to believe the Authoritie and infallibilitie of the Pope, but the testimonie of the Scriptures. For the Fathers and Councels receiving all their authoritie and infallibilitie frō the Pope, cannot give him the infallibilitie and authoritie they received from him. Now how senseless a resolution of Faith this is (though most of the Papists have no better and no other) you may perceive by some few instances. It is as

if

if a Student ſhould ſay thus: I ſhould not believe ſuch a book to be an excellent book, but for my Tutors teſtimonie, who tels me ſo. And again: I ſhould not believe my Tutors teſtimonie to be of any validity, but for the teſtimonie of that book concerning him. Who would not laugh at ſuch an aſſertion? Or as if a man ſhould ſay: I ſhould not believe the honeſty of *Richard* were it not for the teſtimony of *Thomas*. And I ſhould not believe the honeſty of *Thomas*, were it not for the teſtimonie of *Richard*. Where is there a man that will accept of ſuch ſecurity in a trivial worldly bargain? and yet the Papiſts are content to venture their Souls upon it. From all that hath been ſaid, I conclude, that the pretended authorities we have diſcourſed of, do neither ſeverally nor yet jointly afford a ſolid Foundation for a Papiſts Faith, nor prove that infallibilitie which they pretend to; and conſequently, there is no ſolid Foundation for a Papiſts Faith. And here I might diſcharge my ſelf from further trouble, having diſcovered the Nullity of all the pretences which have been hitherto owned by the Church of *Rome*.

CHAP. V.

Of Oral Tradition, and the teſtimonie of the preſent Church.

§. 1. BUt becauſe I am reſolved to do their cauſe all the right that may be, and give them all the favourable allowance they can deſire, I ſhall conſider the ſingular conceipts of their private Doctors, where the authors are any whit conſiderable, and their opinion hath any thing of plauſibility. There then is another ſhift, which ſome ſubtle Romaniſts have lately invented, who perceiving how their brethren have been beaten out of the

that field by ſtrength of Scripture and argument, in the conceit about the infallibility of the Pope or Councel, come in for their ſuccour with an Univerſal Tradition, and the authoritie of the preſent Church. This is the way of *Ruſhworth* in his Dialogues, Mr. *White*, and *Holden*, and Sir *Kenelm Digby*, and *S. Clara*. Their defence and diſcourſe is this, for I ſhall give you their opinion in their own words. *A man may prudently believe the preſent Church for her ſelf, and ought ſo to do: a man needs not, nor is obliged to enquire further; — there he may ſafely fix:* (a) ſaith *S. Clara*. Thus the L. *Faulklands* Adverſary: *That ſociety of Chriſtians, which alone pretend to teach nothing but what they have received from their Fathers, and they from theirs, and ſo from the Apoſtles, they muſt needs hold the truth which was firſt delivered: for if they could teach falſhoods, then ſome age muſt either have erred in underſtanding their Anceſtors, or have joined to deceive their poſterity, neither of which is credible. But the Church of Rome, and they onely, pretend to teach nothing elſe,* &c. Ergo *they muſt needs hold the truth.* The acute Mr. *White* explains the opinion more exactly and fully, and the ſtrength of his and their notion I ſhall give you in his words.

1. *The nations did underſtand the Doctrine taught by the Apoſtles, and practiſed it, and highly valued it, as moſt neceſſary for them and their poſteritie, and to be preferred before all other things.*

2. *Thoſe firſt Chriſtians even at their death, both could and would, and therefore doubtleſſe did moſt vehemently commend this doctrine to their children: and the Fathers did alwaies deliver the ſame doctrine which they received from*

(a) *Prudenter Eccleſiæ præſenti propter ſeipſam credi poteſt & debet. — non eſt opus, nec obligatur homo ad inquirendum ulterius, ibi tuto ſiſtì poteſt. Syſtem. fidei c. 10. ubi diſcrtè aſſerit teſtimonium præſentis Eccleſiæ eſſe infallibile.*

their

their Parents, and under that notion because they had received it.

3. *If any delivered another doctrine, he could be proved a lyar by the rest of the world; or if all should agree against their consciences to deliver a new doctrine, under that notion* (*scil.* of a Doctrine delivered from their parents) *that whole age would be guilty of treachery and parricide, and should agree to murder themselves, which is impossible.*

4. *There was a perpetual succession of Pastors, who took care of Faith and Manners; and it is evident, that the Pastors and people had the same Faith.*

5. *And there arose heresies, by which the truth might be more cleared, and they that maintained the antient doctrine might be distinguished from Innovators: which Innovators did not publickly reject the Apostles doctrine, but pleaded it was not rightly understood, and the other part kept the name of the Catholick Church.*

6. *It is necessary that that congregation, which always kept the antient discipline, should alone professe that she received her opinions from Christ by perpetual succession, and that she neither did nor could receive any thing into the Canon of their Faith under another notion.*

7. *As certainly therefore, as one may know, that the congregation of believers, which at this day is called Catholick, is animated with a number of learned and wise men, so certainly will it be known, that she is not conscious of any newness of doctrine, and therefore there is no new doctrine.*

8. *Following ages cannot be ignorant, what former ages believed about those things which are explained in Sermons, Catechismes, Prayers, and Sacraments, and such are all things necessary to the Catholick Faith.*

9. *This doctrine delivered from hand to hand was confirmed by long custome, diverse lawes, rewards and punishments both of this and the following life, monuments of writers, by which all would be kept in it.*

10. *Following*

10. *Following Rulers could not change the doctrine of their Predeceſſors without ſchiſme, and notorious tumult in the Church, as daily Experience proveth.* (a) To the ſame

(a) 1. Gentes intelligebant, quòd Apoſtoli docuerunt, & opere complebant, eamque doctrinam magni æſtimabant, & ſummè neceſſariam ſibi & poſteris ſuis & cæteris omnibus negotiis præponendam. 2. Illi ergo primi Chriſtiani doctrinam iſtam filiis & ſucceſſoribus & potuerunt & voluerunt, etiam morientes, enixiſſimè commendare, ideóque indubiè hoc fecerunt. Et patres filiis eandem doctrinam ſemper tradiderunt, quam ipſimet acceperant à majoribus, & eo titulo credebant quia acceperant. 3. Si quiſquam aliam (doctrinam) traderet, mendacii à reliquo orbe convinceretur, vel ſi omnes novam conarentur eo titulo tradere, conſcientia teſte, perfidii et parricidii tota illa ætas condemnaretur, & veluti ad ſe occidendos conſpirarent, quod impoſſibile eſt. 4. Paſtores perpetuò ſucceſſerunt, qui curam fidei et morum gererent: (conſtat autem quòd populi et paſtorum una fuit fides, una doctrina. *Idem trac.* 2. §. 5. *pag.* 114.) 5. Et hæreſes ortæ ſunt, quibus veritas magis eluceſceret et diſtingueretur recentiores doctrinæ antiquæ contra novatores. Qui quidem novatores non palam averſabantur doctrinam Apoſtolorum, ſed eſſe malè intellectam contendebant: reliquæ autem parti manſit nomen Catholicæ Eccleſiæ. 6. Neceſſe eſt autem eam fidelium congregationem, quæ ſemper antiquæ diſciplinæ tenax erat, ſolam profiteri ſe à Chriſto per ſucceſſionem perpetuam dogmata ſua accepiſſe, nec quicquam alio titulo recepiſſe in fidei Canonem; neque unquam recipere poſſe. 7. Quanta itaque certitudine quiſquam agnoſcere poteſt congregationem illam fidelium, quæ hodie Catholica dicitur, eſſe virorum prudentium et doctorum multitudine animatam, tanta certitudine ipſi conſtabit eam non eſſe conſciam ſibi de aliqua doctrinæ novitate, ideoque nullam eſſe novitatem. 8. Nullo modo poteſt latere ſuccedanea ſæcula, quid præeuntia crediderint circa ea quæ concionibus, catechеſibus, orationibus, et ſacramentis exponuntur: talia autem ſunt univerſa ad fidem Catholicam neceſſaria. 9. Confirmata erat hæc doctrina per manus tradita longa conſuetudine, variis legibus, præmiis et pœnis tum hujus tum ſequentis vitæ, ſcripturarum monumentis, quibus omnes in ea retinerentur. *Thomas Anglus in ſono buccinæ, de fide & Theol. tract.* 1. *parag.* 4. & 5. 10. Reſtores ſuccedanei non poterant deceſſoris doctrinam immutare abſque ſchiſmate, et notorio Eccleſiæ tumultu, ut quotidiana experientia comprobat. *De fide & Theol. tract.* 2, *parag.* 3.

purpoſe

purpose also *Holden* discourseth in his Treatise *of the resolution of Faith.* This is a new Plea, and deserves special consideration.

§. 2. For Answer, 1. I give Mr. *White* and his worthy Partners humble thanks for the great favour or rather justice done by them to the Protestant cause. For, whereas this is the perplexing question, wherewith they think to puzzle us, How we can know the Scriptures to be the word of God without the Churches infallible authoritie? and from the supposed infallibilitie thereof, they infer the necessitie of the Churches authoritie: these kind-hearted Gentlemen have helped us out of the buyars: for now it seems, and it is a truth, and so far the argument from Tradition is really conclusive, that we may know the Scripture to be the word of God without the Churches infallible authority, *viz.* by tradition. And the argumēt of Traditiō would not at all lose its strength if the church were wholly stript of the capacity of a judg, and retained only the qualification of a witness, and consequently the Churches authority is not at all necessary. And if the Church should boast of her authority against or above Tradition, it may be said to her according to these mens principles, as the Apostle said to the Gentiles, Rom. 11. *If thou boast, thou bearest not tradition, but Tradition thee,* for so say these Doctors. Mr. *White* spends one entire chapter upon the proof of this Proposition, *that the succession of doctrine is the only rule of Faith* (a), and saith, *that whether we place this infallibilitie in the whole body of the Church, or in Councels, or in Scriptures, in each of these their authority is resolved into and all depends upon Tradition* (b). And he spends several Chapters to shew,

(a) *De fide & Theol. tract.* 2. *Parag.* 18.

(b) *Sive infallibilitatem in corpore Ecclesiæ — statueris, firmitas & possessio doctrinæ, quam habet est traditio; sive in Conciliis, — sive in Scripturis, earum authoritas in traditionem resolvitur. De fide & Theol, tract.* 1. *parag.* 18.

that *neither the Pope, nor Councels can give any solidity, or certaintie to our Faith, but what they have from Tradition.* If it be said, Tradition is conveyed to us by the Church, and so there is still a necessitie of her Authoritie. I answer plainly, no. It followes onely, that there is necessity of her Ministrie, but not of her Authoritie. A Proclamation of the King and Councel could not come to my hands, (if I live at *York*,) but by a Messenger, and by the Scribe or Printer: But if any from this necessity of his Ministry infer his Authoritie, I may well deny the consequence. But because it is unhandsome to extenuate a courtesie, I hold my self obliged further to acknowledge the great kindnesse of our Adversaries, who not contented to assert the validitie of the Protestants Foundation of Faith, have also overturned their own, which that you may the better understand, I shall briefly represent to you the sweet Harmony of these *Cadmean* Brethren, and how God hath confounded the language of *Babels* Builders: so that they have little to doe, but to stand still, and see the salvation of God, while these *Midianites* and *Amalikites* thrust their swords in one anothers sides.

The opinion and language of most papists in the world is this, That *Tradition is therefore onely infallible, because it is delivered to us by the Church which is infallible.* (a) If you ask *Bellarmine* what it is, by which I am assured that a Tradition is right, he answers because the whole Church which receives it cannot erre. (b) So the late

(a) *Labyrinthus Cantuariensis. p. 68.*

(b) *Quando universa Eccl'esia aliquid servat, vel aliquid tanquam fidei dogma amplectitur quod non est scriptum, necesse est dicere ab Apostolis traditum. Ratio est, quia cum Ecclesia universa errare non possit, 1 Tim. 3. &c. Certè quod Ecclesia de fide esse credit, sine dubio est de fide. de verbo Dei lib. 4 c. 9.*

Answer of Bishop *Laud*. *There is no means left to beleive any thing with a divine infallible Faith, if the Authoritie of the Catholick Church be rejected as erroneous, and fallible, for who can believe either Creed, or Scripture, or unwritten Tradition, but upon her Authoritie.* (a) Nay, S. *Clara* himself, notwithstanding his Romantick strain, That Tradition, and the naked *Testimonie of the present Church is sufficient*, yet elsewhere confesseth the Churches infallibilitie must necessarily be supposed to make my Faith certain. His words are these: *The Testimonie of the Church, by which Traditions come to us, is infallible, from a Divine Revelation, because it is evident from the Scripture, that the Church is infallible*: and presently after, *If the Church were not infallible, it could not produce in us an infallible Faith* (b). And this was the constant Doctrine of the Romish Masters in all former Ages. Now come a new Generation, who finding the Notion of Infallibilitie hard beset, and the pillar shaken, they support their cause with a quite contrary position, *that it is not the Churches infallibilitie that renders Tradition infallible* (as their former masters held *but the infallibilitie of Tradition that makes the Church infallible*, and therefore they say, *the Church her self is no further infallible than she follows Tradition*. Thus Mr. *White* plainly tels us, that [c] *Councels are not infallible because the special assistance of Gods spirit makes them infallible, but because by irrefragable testimonie*

(a) *In Lauds labyrinth. ch. pag.* 17. (b) *Dico secundo quòd testimonium Ecclesiæ per quod nobiles illa veritates (traditæ) innotescunt infallibile est, nempe ob revelationem divinam: quia manifestè habemus in Scripturis, Ecclesiam esse infallibilem—si igitur illa [Authoritas Ecclesiæ] non esset infallibilis, non produceretur in nobis fides infallibilis. Systema fidei c.* 10. *num.* 3. (c) *Non quia speciali spiritus sancti instinctu infallibiliter his afflatur, sed quia irrefragabili testimonio successionem Doctrinæ roborant—& sunt irrecusabiles testes traditionis, pro iis decertandis est. De fide & Theol. tract.* 2. *Parag.* 1.

they confirme the succession of their Doctrines, and are such witnesses of Tradition as cannot be refused.

Thus *Holden* having told us, *that the Popes infallibilitie is controverted on both sides by just, godly, and most learned Catholicks, as well antient as modern, and neither side condemned by Authentick censure* [a], (which, by the way, discovers the desperateness of the greatest part of the Romish Church at this day, which venture their Soules, and rest their Faith upon what themselves confesse to be a doubtful Foundation, *viz.* the Popes infallibilitie:) [b] *All Divines* (saith he) *confesse it is not certain with a Divine and a Catholick Faith,* (he comes to lay down this Conclusion,) *that the infallibility of the Church is not from any priviledg granted to the Roman See, or S. Peters Successor, but from the Universal and Catholick Tradition of the Church* [c], and Councels fare no better than Popes. *They are* (saith he) *not Founders, but onely Guardians and Witnesses of revealed Truth* [d]. So Mr. *White* allowes neither Pope nor Councels any infallibilitie, but what they have from Tradition, as we have seen; and tels us in expresse termes, that *Tradition is overthrown, if any other principle*

(a) *An summorum Pontificum decreta sint ex institutione Christi ab omni errore libera—hæc, inquam, in utramq; partem ventilata videmus à piissimis quamplurimis & doctissimis Catholicis Authoribus tam antiquioribus, quàm recentioribus, quorum neutram partem audivimus unquam fuisse censuris aliquibus authenticis prohibitam aut improbatam: Quapropter evidentissimè constat Catholicum neminem astringi aut huic aut alteri parti adhærere tanquam fidei Catholicæ & Divinæ articulo.* ——*De resolut. fidei lib. 2. c. 1. pag. 174.* (b) *Nec opus est, meo judicio, divinam infallibilitatem Romanæ sedi annectere (quod omnes Theologi agnoscunt non esse divina & Catholica fide certum. Id. ib. p. 178.* (c) *Ecclesiæ infallibilitas non privilegio aliquo aut sedi Romanæ, aut sancti Petri successori divinitus impartito—sed universæ & Catholicæ traditioni Ecclesiæ ——præcipuè tribuenda est. idem ib. p. 174.* (d) *Episcopi in Conciliis sunt tantummodo Custodes, ac Testes veritatum revelatarum, non autem conditores. Holden lib. 1. c. 9. p. 153.*

Answer of Bishop *Laud*. *There is no means left to beleive any thing with a divine infallible Faith, if the Authoritie of the Catholick Church be rejected as erroneous, and fallible, for who can believe either Creed, or Scripture, or unwritten Tradition, but upon her Authoritie.* (a) Nay, S. *Clara* himself, notwithstanding his Romantick strain, That Tradition, and the naked *Testimonie of the present Church is sufficient*, yet elsewhere confesseth the Churches infallibilitie must necessarily be supposed to make my Faith certain. His words are these: *The Testimonie of the Church, by which Traditions come to us, is infallible, from a Divine Revelation, because it is evident from the Scripture, that the Church is infallible:* and presently after, *If the Church were not infallible, it could not produce in me an infallible Faith* (b). And this was the constant Doctrine of the Romish Masters in all former Ages. Now come a new Generation, who finding the Notion of Infallibilitie hard beset, and the pillar shaken, they support their cause with a quite contrary position, *that it is not the Churches infallibilitie that renders Tradition infallible* (as their former masters held *but the infallibilitie of Tradition that makes the Church infallible*, and therefore they say, *the Church her self is no further infallible than she follows Tradition.* Thus Mr. *White* plainly tels us, that (c) *Councels are not infallible because the special assistance of Gods spirit makes them infallible, but because by irrefragable testimonie*

(a) *In Lauds labyrinth. ch. pag. 17.* (b) *Dico secundo quòd testimonium Ecclesiæ per quod nobiles illæ veritates (traditæ) innotescunt infallibile est, nempe ob revelationem divinam: quia manifestè habemus in Scripturis, Ecclesiam esse infallibilem—si igitur illa [Authoritas Ecclesiæ] non esset infallibilis, non produceretur in nobis fides infallibilis. Systema fidei c. 10. num. 3.* (c) *Non quia speciali spiritus sancti instinctu infallibilitas iis affletur, sed quia irrefragabili testimonio successionem Doctrinæ roborant—& sunt irrecusabiles testes traditionis, pro iis decertandis est. De fide & Theol. tract. 2. Parag. 21.*

they

they confirme the succession of their Doctrines, and are such witnesses of Tradition as cannot be refused.

Thus *Holden* having told us, *that the Popes infallibilitie is controverted on both sides by just, godly, and most learned Catholicks, as well antient as modern, and neither side condemned by Authentick censure* [a], (which, by the way, discovers the desperateness of the greatest part of the Romish Church at this day, which venture their Soules, and rest their Faith upon what themselves confesse to be a doubtful Foundation, *viz* the Popes infallibilitie:) [b] *All Divines* (saith he) *confesse it is not certain with a Divine and a Catholick Faith,* (he comes to lay down this Conclusion,) *that the infallibility of the Church is not from any priviledg granted to the Roman See, or S. Peters Successor, but from the Universal and Catholick Tradition of the Church* [c], and Councels fare no better than Popes. *They are* (saith he) *not Founders, but onely Guardians and Witnesses of revealed Truth* [d]. So Mr. *White* allowes neither Pope nor Councels any infallibilitie, but what they have from Tradition, as we have seen; and tels us in expresse termes, that *Tradition is overthrown, if any other principle*

(a) *An summorum Pontificum decreta sint ex institutione Christi ab omni errore libera—hæc, inquam, in utramq; partem ventilata videmus à piissimis quamplurimis & doctissimis Catholicis Authoribus tam antiquioribus, quàm recentioribus, quorum neutram partem audivimus unquam fuisse censuris aliquibus authenticis prohibitam aut improbatam? Quapropter evidentissimè constat Catholicum neminem astringi aut huic aut alteri parti adhærere tanquam fidei Catholicæ & Divinæ articulo.* ——*De resolut. fidei lib. 2. c. 1. pag.* 174. (b) *Nec opus est, meo judicio, divinam infallibilitatem Romanæ sedi asserere (quod omnes Theologi agnoscunt non esse divina & Catholica fide certum. Id. ib. p.* 178. (c) *Ecclesiæ infallibilitas non privilegio aliquo aut sedi Romanæ, aut sancti Petri successori divinitus impartito—sed universæ & Catholicæ traditioni Ecclesiæ ——præcipuè tribuenda est. idem ib. p.* 174. (d) *Episcopi in Conciliis sunt tantummodo Custodes, ac Testes veritatum revelatarum, non autem conditores. Holden lib.* 1. *c.* 9. *p.* 153.

be added to it: For here lies the solidity of Tradition, that nothing is accepted by the Church but from Tradition.[a]

§. 3. Well, what shall the poor unlearned Romanist do, that finds his great Masters at variance in the very Foundation of his Faith? Here are two contradictory assertions; one of them must be unavoidably false. A man may with probability at least assert the Falshood of either of them, having the suffrage of diverse of their own most learned Catholick Authors for him in either opinion; but whether they be true or false, their cause is lost.

1. If they be true. And 1. if that be true, that Tradition be the Foundation of the Churches infallibility, then 1. Whence hath Tradition this infallibilitie? From Scripture? That they utterly disclaim. From Tradition? Then why may not Scripture give Testimonie to it self as well as Tradition? And whence hath that Tradition its infallibilitie? and so *in infinitum?* Is it from the reason of the thing? So Mr. *White* implies, who attempts to prove it by rational and Logical Discourse, but himself hath prevented that, while he saith, *To lean upon Logical inferences is to place the Foundation of our Faith and the Church in the Sand*[b]. And S. *Clara* gives a check to this: *It is more reasonable and wise, even for the most Learned and acute persons to relie upon the Authoritie of the Church, than to adhere to our own reasonings how plausible soever*[c], And that is largely disproved in

---

(a) *Evertitur Traditio, si aliud fidei principium ei addatur. Inde enim est Traditionis firmitas, quod nihil nisi ex ea ab Ecclesia accepterur. De fide & Theol. l. 2. parag. 18.*

(b) *Logicis niti rationculis est fidei & Ecclesiæ fundamina in sabulo collocare. ubi supra tract. 2. parag. 18.* (c) *Dico igitur quod rationabilius & sapientius est,, etiam respectu Doctissimorum & acutissimorum hominum, Authoritati Ecclesiæ, quam rationculis nostris licèt apparentissimis adhærere. System. fidei cap. 12. n. 9.*

the

the following Discourse. Is it then from the Churches infallibilitie? This they deny, and allow the Church no infallibilitie independent upon Tradition.

2. Seeing they grant the Church may erre, if she recede from Tradition, I can never be sure she doth not erre, unlesse I be sure she keep to Tradition: And therefore I must examine that, and judge of it, and so private men are made judges of Controversies, which they so much dread.

3. Hereby the Authoritie of the Pope and general Councels of Bishops is rendred unnecessary. I prove it thus: If these be necessary onely as witnesses to Tradition, then their Authoritie is not necessary; for it is not Authoritie, but knowledge and fidelity which renders a witnesse competent. A Lay-hearer of St. *Paul* may be as competent a witnesse of the Doctrine he heard S. *Paul* preach, as a Bishop, supposing a parity in their knowledg, fidelity, and converse with the Apostle; and another Bishop may be as competent a witnesse as the Bishop of *Rome*, and consequently as infallible; and any congregation of discreet and pious Christians, who heard S. *Peter* preach, are as infallible witnesses as the Church of *Rome*; and if there were a general assembly of Lay-men of equal knowledg and Experience, they are as infallible witnesses what the Faith of the next precedent age was, and what the Faith of the present Church is, as a Councel of Bishops: nay (to speak truth) they are more credible witnesses, because lesse biassed by interest, affection, or prejudice. These rocks the first branch throws them upon.

2. If they fly from this, and make the Churches infallibilitie the foundation of Traditions (as the most papists do) then they must demonstrate that infallibilitie from Scripture, Fathers, or Councels, which we have seen they cannot do. So that if either of their positions be true, their cause is lost,

But 2. If either of them be false, they are gone too. For if Tradition be not infallible in it self without the Churches Authority (as the one side saith,) then the Papists have no certain rule for the Church to steer its course by, (for the Scriptures they do not own as such) and if the Church be not infallible but by vertue of this Tradition (as the other side saith,) then they confesse the insufficiency of all their proof from Scripture and from the Authoritie of Fathers and Councels, and their Authoritie is no more than that of any Faithful or credible Historian, and instead of a Divine the Papists have nothing but an Historical Faith. I shall conclude this first Answer with one Syllogisme from the words and assertions of Mr. *White*, *Tradition is overthrown, if another principle of Faith be added to it.* But the most and learnedest Doctors of the Romish Church do adde another principle to it, *viz.* the Churches authoritie and infallibilitie, as I shewed from their own words: *Ergo*, either Tradition, and all this new device, or the Authoritie of the Romish Church is overthrown.

§ 4. *Answ.* 2. This new Conceit directly thwarts the design of God in the writing of the Scripture, and indeed the common sence and experience of all mankind. For hereby a verbal Tradition is made a more sure way of conveyance to posteritie than a writing. It hath been the wisdome of God in former ages to take care that those things might be written, which he would have kept in remembrance. *Exod.* 17. 14. *Write this for a memorial in a Book.* So little did God trust this (now supposed infallible) way of oral Tradition, that we would not venture the Decalogue upon it (though the words were but few, and the importance of them so considerable, both in truth, and in the apprehensions of the Jewes, that if Mr. *Whites* argument have any strength in it, it was impossible posteritie should ever mistake it) but write

write it with his own finger once and again after the breaking of the first Tables. And although, whilest the Church was confined to a Few Families, & divine revelations were frequently renewed, a verbal Tradition was sufficient, yet when the Church came to be multiplied, and especially when it comes to be dispersed into all Nations, and Revelations cease, then Writing proves of absolute necessitie. How farre the first and wisest Christians were from Mr. *Whites* opinion appears from hence, that not daring to lean upon the broken Reed of Oral Tradition, they did earnestly desire the Apostles to commit their Doctrines to writing. *Eusebius* reports that S. *Peters* hearers were not content with this way of Tradition from *Peters* mouth, but (for want of Mr. *Whites* presence there to convince them of their Folly) *they earnestly begged it of* Mark, *that he would leave them that Doctrine in Writing which they had received by word of mouth* [a]. And *Hierome* tels us, that *St. John the Evangelist was almost forced to write by all the Bishops of Asia* [b], who (it seems) were raw Novices, who did not understand their Catechisme, nor the first principle in it, *viz.* the sufficiencie and infallibilitie of Oral Tradition. And St. *Luke* gives it us under his hand (not fearing either Mr. *Whites* Anger or his Argument) that he wrote his Gospel *ad majorem ἀσφάλειαν*, that Christians might have the greater certainty, *Luk.* 1. 3,4. When *Iob* desires the perpetual continuance of his words, he wisheth, *O that my words were now written! Oh that they were Printed in a Book!* Job. 19.23. And *David* in the same case

(a) *A Marco multis & variis precibus contendebant, ut monumentum illud doctrinæ, quod sermone & verbo illis tradidisset, etiam Scriptis mandatum apud eos reliquaret. Histor. lib. 2. cap. 14.* (b) *Johannes Asiæ Episcopis pene omnibus coactus est ad scribendum. Præfat. in Evan. Mat.*

would not rely upon Tradition, but takes this course for assurance: *This shall be written for the generation to come, Psalm.* 102. 18. But because Mr. *White* undoubtedly is a better Philosopher and Divine than either *Luke*, or *Job*, or *David* were, (and therefore good reason they should all vaile to his more penetrating wit and deeper judgment) he shall do well to remember, that God himself was of the same judgment, --*Go, write it before them in a Table, and note it in a Book, that it may be for the time to come for ever. Isa.* 30. 8. And to this agrees the common experience of mankind. *Vox audita perit, litera scripta manet*: verbal Traditions quickly vanish, onely writings are durable. Hence those famous Lawes of *Lycurgus*, Institutes of the *Druides*, Philosophy of *Pythagoras* are upon the matter wholly lost, and onely some few fragments reserved, because not committed to writing. But this will be put out of doubt by reflecting upon the History of Mankind, whereby the aerinesse of this phantasme will be discovered, and the great difference between Tradition and Writing in point of certainty demonstrated. *Adam* and *Noah*, the two successive heads of mankind, did doubtlesse deliver the true Doctrine to their posterity with the same important circumstances, (which Mr. *White* supposeth in the Doctrine of the Gospel) as a Doctrine of everlasting consequence, and they so received it, and for a season transmitted it to their Children. But alas! how soon was all obliterated, and in this sense all mankind (some very few excepted) did agree to murther themselves, and they actually did that which Mr. *White* saith was impossible. And so from hence forward let all Logicians take notice of it, that *Ab esse ad posse non valet consequentia.* Well, some Centuries after comes *Moses*, and by Gods command delivers a Law in Writing, and this Law abides, and the Jewes to this day retain it in remembrance and vene-

ration

ration, and for above 3000 years together have been thereby kept from those Pagan opinions and Idolatries, which all the Scholars of Tradition almost in the whole World have fallen into: and consequently Writing is a sure, and Oral Tradition an unsafe and uncertain way of conveyance: and this principle hath had universal influence upon the actions of wise men, in all ages, and in all things. Hence care hath always been taken for the writing of Canons of Councels, Decrees of Courts, Acts of Parliament (though the importance of them were many times so great and evident, that according to this new notion, Writing was superfluous, and verbal Tradition infallible.) And if those wise men durst never trust unwritten Tradition with their Estates and worldly concernment, shall we be so mad as to venture our Souls upon it? Let Papists do so, who having given up their consciences to the Pope, cannot say their Souls are their own, but let them not be displeased, if we desire to make a wiser bargain. But our English Apostate hath a distinction to salve this grosse absurdity. *It is true* (saith he) *of Doctrines meerly speculative, that the memory is not so safe a depository as Written records, but not of such as may be made as it were visible by practice.* And he is pleased to give an instance in the *Doctrine of the Sacrament and Christs real unfigurative presence in it, which* (saith he) *was more securely and clearly delivered by the Churches practice, than could be by books Written; their Prostrations and Adorations demonstrated their assurance of his real presence, where every mans saying* Amen *at the Priests pronouncing* corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi, *expressed their confession of that Presence, with exclusion of all tropes and figures in the businesse. Exomol.* §. 1. *c.* 8. And are these the great and visible assurances of Doctrines, to which all the security of Writings must strike saile? are these grounds so evident, that the Doctrines could not possibly have

been

been more securely propagated and more clearly and intelligibly delivered to posterity in Writing, as *Cressy* daringly asserts? See *Exomolog. Sect.* 1. *chap.* 8. O the besotting nature of Popery! O the tremendous judgment of God punishing Apostacy with an ἀδόκιμον νοῦς, a reprobate sence! Dare this miserable man say these are clearer evidences of the real presence, than if it had been said *in terminis, This is my Body* in a proper and corporeal sence, or this Bread is converted into the very substance of this Body which you now see? These men may well say what they please, for it appears they can believe what they list.

May I with the Readers leave in few words, discover the shamefull weaknesse and horrid impudence of this assertion. It is true indeed, that the prostrations and adorations of Christians, discover'd their assurance of the real corporeal presence? and of all men living could Mr. *Cressy* say this, who had so oft seen others receive, and himself received the Sacrament in *England* and *Ireland* in a posture of Adoration, *viz.* kneeling, with an assurance of the falshood of that opinion of the real corporal presence? Why might not the Special yet Spiritual presence of Christ in the Sacrament occasion this prostration, as well as the special and spiritual presence of God in the Ark occasioned the Jewes to fall down and worship at his Footstool? And must the poor Clark come in with his *Amen* to help the lame Priest over the Stile? Why, there is not a Protestant, but when he hears these words pronounced, *this is my Body*, will say his Amen to it, and and acknowledg it so to be, but still Christs words must be taken in Christs sence, and that is, though figurative, yet very frequent in such cases. In short, since these are the practical visible Arguments alledged as instances of the infallible certainty of Oral Tradition, above all that can be said in writing, I hope the Reader (who concerns

cernes himself either in matters of credit or conscience) will easily discern and ingenuously confesse both the absurdity of their Arguments and assertion, & the solidity of this second Answer, and the advantage of writing above unwritten Tradition.

§ 5. *Ans.* 3. If this assertion be true and solid, and Tradition be an infallible Foundation of Faith as these men pretend, then no errour could come into the Church under pretence of Tradition from the Apostles. That is evident in it self (else an infallible Authoritie is liable to error, which is a contradiction) and it is granted by our Adversaries, who therefore tell us, that all Hereticks recede from the Tradition of their Fathers, and broach new and unheard of Doctrines, as we have seen.

But errors may come into the Church under pretence of Tradition. Here all the doubt lies, and therefore I shall endeavour to make it good; a task which would be wholly superfluous, if the impudence of our Adversaries, and the desperateness of their cause did not oblige them to require, and us to give the proof of the most evident Verities. I might insist upon the doctrine of the *Chiliasts* (which the papists confesse to be false) which was commended to the Church by *Papias* and *Ireneus* too as an Apostolical Tradition, and so received by the generality of Orthodox Christians saith *Justin Martyr*. This argument is rendred more considerable, by the pitiful evasion wherewith Mr. *White* shuffles it off, saying, *That the Chiliasts were deceived by* Cerinthus, *who feigned he had this from the Apostles in private discourses, not in publick preaching.*(a) For (to say nothing of this that the Fathers derive its pedigree from another root) whatever was the occasion and ground of this mi-

(a) *De fide & Theolog. tract.* 1. § 7. *p.* 20.

stake

stake in that Tradition, it sufficiently proves what I intend *viz.* that many or most of the Guides of the Church may receive false Doctrines as coming from the Apostles, and so transmit them to their Posteritie, which is the thing now denied. It was an old Observation of *Irenæus* concerning the Hereticks of his time (one would think the words were not onely Historical of them, but also Prophetical of the Papists,) *When Hereticks are reproved out of the Scripture, they begin to accuse the Scripture, as if Truth could not be discovered by those that know not Tradition* (a). The *Arrians* pretended they had their Doctrine by Tradition from their Ancestors: particularly they named *Origen, Dionysius, Alexandrinus*, and *Lucian* the Martyr, by whose hands their Doctrine had been conveyed to them, as *Baronius* acknowledgeth. *Epiphanius* tels us, the *Cajani* pretended S. *Paul* as the Author and Founder of their Heretical Doctrines. The *Pelagians* boasted of their Doctrine, *That it had been alwaies celebrated by the Learning of Holy men* (b). The Doctrine of rebaptization (which the Papists acknowledg to be erroneous) was brought in by *Cyprian* and the *African* Bishops, under a pretence of Tradition: The words of *Cyprian* are these: *We do not now broach a new Doctrine, but one long since decreed by our Predecessors* (c). It is true *Pamelius* saith he means this of his immediate Predecessors, *Agrippinus*, and the rest; and that will serve my turne, if Mr. *Whites* Argument will hold: for then no

(a) *Cum ex Scripturis arguuntur hæretici, in accusationem convertuntur Scripturarum; quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciunt Traditionem. lib. 3. c. 2. pag. 169.*

(b) *Eam sanctorum virorum semper celebravit eruditio. Aug. lib. 1. contra Julianum. & lib 2. de Bapt. c. 3.*

(c) *Sententiam nostram non novam promimus, sed jampridem ab antecessoribus nostris statutam. Epist. 73.*

Ag-

Age (and consequently not this) could either be ignorant of, or knowingly recede from the Doctrine of their Fathers, nor they from their Fathers, and so upward to the Apostles. And indeed *Cyprian* carries it higher, even to the Apostles, whiles he cals it *The Faith of the Catholick Church*, and reckons it amongst the *Apostolical and Evangelical Precepts* [a]. And *Firmilian* expresly affirmes it was delivered by Christ and his Apostles [b]. And will these mens confidence yet serve them to assert, that no errour could come into the Church by Tradition?

If all those Eminent *African* Bishops and Churches might either mis-understand their Ancestors or deceive their Posteritie, (as Mr. *White* cannot deny they did either the one or other) why might not the *Spanish* or *French* or *Romish* do it. If it be said, there was a promise to the contrary at least for the Church of *Rome*. To say no thing of the manifest weaknesse of that pretence, I answer two things: 1. That Mr. *White* expressely rejects this Infallibilitie by promise. 2. However this Argument being of another nature, and depending not upon the promise of God, but the nature and evidence of the thing, is by this instance irrefragably overthrown.

Answ. 4 That way of proving, which was rejected by the Prophets and godly Jews, by Christ and by the Apostles, is not to be approved, much lesse preferred before that way which they approved and used; but this way of proving the truth of a Doctrine by Tradition from their next Ancestors and the Testimonie of the present Church was rejected by the Prophets &c. and by Christ

(a) *Quare Ecclesiæ Catholicæ fidem ac veritatem & tenere debemus firmiter & docere, & per omnia Evangelica & Apostolica præcepta rationem divinæ dispensationis atq; unitatis ostendere.* Epist. 73. ad Julianum.

(b) *Nos veritati consuetudinem jungimus ab initio hoc tenentes quod a Christo & ab Apostolo traditum est.* Epist. 75. Cypr. p. 164. edit. Rigalt.

and

and the Apostles: *Ergo*, it is not now to be approved. For the *Minor* (in which all the doubt lies) it consists of two Branches: the first relating to the old Testament, the second to the New.

The first is: That this way was disowned by the Prophets and godly Jewes under the the old Testament. It is true some of the Jewes did own this popish opinion as you may read *Jer.* 44. 17. But the Prophets were of another perswasion, *Ezek.* 20. 18. *Walk not in the statutes of your Fathers.* And from Tradition they used to send their people *to the Law and Testimonie*, Isa. 8. 20. And the godly Kings of *Judah* did not make Tradition (as the Papists do) but the written Law (as the Protestants do) the rule of their reformation. Thus *David* 1 Chron. 16. 40. —*to do according to all that is written in the Law.* Thus *Hezekiah* 2 Chron. 3. 1. he did all, *as it is written in the Law of the Lord.* So *Josiah* 2 Chron 34. 30, 31. and 35. 12. The like did *Ezra* long after, *Ezra* 6. 18. and *Nehemiah* chap. 8. *They dwelt in Booths as it is written.* Here Scripture recovers what Tradition had lost, for though God had commanded this, yet *since the dayes of* Joshua *they had not done so*, vers. 17. By all which we evidently discerne how different their opinion was from this of the Papists, and how little confidence they put in Tradition. *Josiah* would not so much as make *Hezekiahs* reformation his rule, nor *Hezekiah* take his pattern from *Jehoshaphats* reformation, but still every one had immediate recourse to the written Word; for it seems it was a Language that these Holy men understood not, that *Scripture was a corrupt Writing, a leaden rule, a dumb Master.*

§. 7. There is indeed one Objection against the consequence from the Jewes to the Christians, and from the Old Testament to the New: I shall give it you in the words of one of the acutest of our Adversaries, *i. e.* Mr.

Mr. *White*, *The Law of the Jewes was delivered in Tables of Stone, and the volumn of the Law, to which it is expresly opposed that God will write the Law of Christians in their hearts* [a].

Ianswer, 1. The words are not to be understood absolutely (as they sound) but comparatively, not as if they did wholly deny that the Mosaical Law was written in the Heart (for that is affirmed in other places, as *Deut.* 30.6. *The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart and the heart of thy seed,*) or as if they did affirme that the Christian Law was written onely in mens Hearts, and not in Paper (which the Papists themselves dare not assert) but onely it is a comparative Expression, like that, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, *Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach*, i. e. principally and primarily, for else the one as well as the other was enjoyned by God. And so it is here implied, that the Christian Law should be written more eminently upon the Hearts of Christians, than it ordinarily was upon the Hearts of the Jewes, and that it should be writ in a more legible Character.

Answ. 2. If we examine in whose hearts this Christian Law is written, we shall find it concernes not the Tradition of the Church, by which all things are to be regulated. For I demand of them, was this promise made and performed to all that are called Christians, or onely to the elect and sincere Christians, or onely to the Pope and Bishops? If they say the first, then one Christian as well as another is furnished with this rule of all Controversies, and consequently as able to judge of con-

(a) *Certissimum est legem Judæorum Tabulis lapideis & Deuteronomii volumine traditam esse, cui opponitur expresse in Prophetis Deum legem Christianorum in cordibus fidelium scripturum. De fide Tract.* 1. §. 6.

troversies

troversies; then Lay-men and Ministers have this Law equally written in their Hearts: if they say the second, that is, onely the elect and sincere Christians (as indeed it is,) then it must be something else beside Tradition, which is no lesse known to the hypocritical pretender than to the sincere professor of Christianitie. If they say the third, That this Law was written onely in the hearts of the Pope and Bishops met in Councel, (as what is there so ridiculous, which some of our Adversaries will not say, rather than confesse their errours, and give glory to God?) they are evidently confuted by the words of the place, *Jer.* 31.34. *They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every one his Brother, saying, know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest—for I will forgive their iniquity.* And besides Mr. *White* himself saith, this Law is written onely *in cordibus fidelium*, in the hearts of the Faithful: Now in what Dictionary we shall find *fidelis* or be translated Atheist, Sodomite, Magician, *&c.* (Epithetes not without cause given to Popes and Popish Bishops by their own Authors) I would gladly be informed.

Answ. 3. If we enquire what this is, which is here said to be written in their hearts, we shall see Mr. *White's* invention was better than his judgment or his conscience: with what Spectacles do these men read this Writing in the heart, that tell us this was the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, Indulgences, Invocation of Saints, Popes Supremacy, the Churches infallibility? But you must know, though this Writing was from God, yet the interpretation belongs to the Pope, whose Will stands for his reason, and his word for a Law: But if we consult the Prophet, if with the Popes good leave God may be his own Interpreter, He tels you this was the Inscription, γνῶθι Κύριον, *Know the Lord.* The knowledge of God, *Jer.* 31.33. and the fear of God, *Jer.* 32, 39, 40.

and

And this Law written in the heart was so far from being appointed by God for a rule to walk by (much lesse was it to justle out the word, as the Papists now abuse it) that the use of this was onely to help them to make the word their rule, *Ezek.* 26 27. *I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes*: Hence that in *Is.* 59 21. *My Spirit that is in you, and my words which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth.* So this objection being discharged, the consequence remaines in full force, and Traditions being disapproved under the old Testament cannot be approved under the New: But I shall more fully prove that in the next branch, which is this.

§. 8. 2. This way of proving the truth of Doctrines by verbal Tradition is disallowed by Christ and the Apostles. He knowes nothing of the Pharisees, and indeed but little of the New Testament, that knowes not that this was the great Doctrine of the Pharisees; and from their School the Papists had this Doctrine of the certainty of Tradition: so little reason had *Du Moulin* to write a Book about the novelty of Popery, when diverse of their Doctrines have such a venerable Antiquity, that they are as old as the Pharisees. No wonder the Church of *Rome* hath diverse Doctrines that Christ never delivered to them, for they had a great part of the leaven of the Pharisees left them for a Legacy: And from them they had their bold expressions, by which they advance Tradition above the Scripture. The Author of the book called עמורי גולה hath this saying, *Think not that the written Law is the Foundation of our Faith, but the Law of Oral Tradition.* And again in the Book *Juchas: p.* 158. *Without this oral Law* (of Tradition) *the whole law would be in darknesse*: and again, *all those things which our Rabbins taught us we are equally to believe as the Law of Moses.* But this is so known, that it is frivolous to multiply

testimonies of this kind. The footsteps of this principle you may discern in diverse places of the New Testament. They made the Tradition of the Fathers the rule of their Faith, *Matth.* 15. 2. *Why do thy Disciples transgresse the Tradition of the Elders?* S. *Paul* mentions it as one of his Pharisaical errours, *That he was exceedingly zealous of the Traditions of his Fathers*, *Gal.* 1. 14. And S. *Peter* speaks of it as a part or effect of their Redemption by Christ, that *they were delivered from a vain conversation received by Tradition from the Fathers*, 1 *Peter* 1. This sufficiently shewes what their opinion was. Now let us hear what reflection Christ and the Apostles made on it: And there you shall find that which would end the controversie with ingenious Adversaries, *viz.* That whereas the Romanists tell us that the deserting of Tradition is the true cause and spring of all Errours, on the contrary our Saviour makes this the Fountain of their errours, their forsaking the Scripture, not their receding from the Tradition of their Ancestors, *Mat.* 22. 29. *Ye do erre, not knowing the Scriptures*, we are beholden to the Papists that they do not say, there is a corruption in the Text, and *Scripture* is put in for *Tradition*: for surely if Christ had been of the mind of these Gentlemen, he never had a fitter opportunity to utter it than now, for the Sadduces were noted as enemies to Traditions; And the Doctrine of the Resurrection was but darkly delivered in Scripture, at least in the Pentateuch, and more plainly by Tradition. So now or never was the time for Christ to say to the Sadduces, (as doubtless Mr. *White* would, if he had been present, and Christ should, if Mr. *Whites* Argument be good) *You erre, because you take no heed to the Traditions of your Ancestors.* But here is not a syllable about that, but all is cast upon their not knowing the Scriptures. Thus in the resolution of that great controversie concerning the *Messias*, Christ doth

not

not confute the Jewes, nor stablish the Truth from Tradition (though there was eminent occasion for it at that time, there being such a Tradition then risen amongst them, that the time of the comming of the *Messias* was at hand, *Daniel's* Weeks being nigh expired, and with it a general expectation of him) but from Scripture. Christ proves himself to be the true *Messias* by several Arguments, by the Testimony of *John* (who was a Prophet, yea more than a Prophet) by his Fathers voice from Heaven, by his miracles, and above all by the Scripture, how came Christ to omit that which (if those men do not deceive us) was more considerable than all the rest, *viz.* Tradition, and the Testimony of the present Church. A strange oversight, you will say, but it seems it was a discovery denied to Christ, and all the Apostles, and reserved to these last times. Answerable to this was the practise of the godly *Bereans*, who did examine St. *Pauls* Doctrine not by Tradition (as the Papists doe) but the Scripture, *Act.*17.11. And St. *Paul* himselfe evidenceth the soundnesse of his Doctrine, not by its conformity with Tradition (which our Adversaries lay such stresse upon, that S. *Clara* with several others affirme, that *they receive the Scriptures onely so far as they agree with Tradition* (a), but by its consonancy to the Scriptures saying, *That he witnessed none other thing than what was in Moses and the Prophets*, Acts 26.22. and *Acts* 24.14,15. So then, the question now is, which is the more rational way to resolve a Christians doubt and

(a) *Prodiit quidam* Dialogus *à* Docto *amico meo compositus*—— *idemiter* Parisiis *approbatus à* Doctoribus *deputatis* Sorbona—— *expresse asserit*, Ecclesiam *ideo recipere* Scripturas, *quia & in quantum sunt conformes fidei quam ab Apostolis per Traditiones accepit, non è converso. Et hactenus sine dubio rectissimè*, System.*cap.*11. *in initio.*

ground his Faith, whether that which hath had the approbation of all the Holy men of God in both Testaments, or the ingenious device of their witty Doctor, that come with their *quintum Evangelium* into the World, that is, whether Scripture or Tradition. I know one thing will be said, that the Apostles did urge Traditions as well as Scriptures; to this purpose we oft hear of that 2 *Thes.*2.15. *Hold the Tradition which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle.* To which I answer briefly.

1. That if the Papists can demonstrate any of their Traditions to be indeed Apostolical (as these were) we shall receive them, if conformable to Scripture; but if they be dissonant from Scripture, we have commission from St. *Paul* to renounce them, though they be either of Apostolical or Angelical original, *Gal.* 1.8,9.

2. The Argument I confesse is right of the Romish stamp, *viz.* The *Thessalonians* were bound to receive what they heard immediately from S. *Pauls* mouth in such things as for the substance of them were contained in the Scripture; therefore we are now bound to receive all those Traditions which the Church of *Rome* tells us they had from those, that had them from those, that had them from those, that told them their Ancestors were told by their Ancestors, that some of their Ancestors had it from *Paul* 1600 years agoe, --*risum teneatis amici.* This may serve for the fourth Answer.

§.9. *Ans.*5. If this Doctrine be true, Scripture-proof is not necessary for any point in Religion (for it asserts the sufficiency of Tradition in it self, and without the Scripture:) but Scripture-proof is necessary for confirmation of points in Religion. This I might prove from Scripture, but that hath been done already in the former Answer, therefore I shall here confute this Argument of Tradition by Tradition and the testimony of the Fa-

thers.

thers. To pick up all they have to this purpose would fill Volumes; I shall therefore single out some few illustrious Testimonies: Nothing can more evidently overthrow this goodly structure than those forementioned words of Cyprian, *We ought not to regard what others have done before us, but what Christ, who was before all, thought sit to be done: For we must follow Gods Truth, not mens custome.* What Protestant can say more in few words than *Clemens Alexandrinus* in few words, *We assert nothing without Scripture* [a]; therefore he thought not Tradition a sure evidence, though so neer the Fountain, much lesse can it now give us any certainty, having conflicted with hazards, and been exposed to the infection of 1300 years. St. *Basil* is expresse: *It is necessary that every word or thing be confirmed by the Holy Scriptures* (b). And elsewhere he tels you, *it is a manifest defection from the Faith, and token of Pride, either to reject any thing that is written, or to introduce any thing that is not written* (c). And *Constantine* speaking of the rule by which all things were to be examined and judged, confines it to the Scripture. *The Books of the Prophets and Apostles* (saith he) *do plainly instruct us what to think of Divine things: therefore laying aside hostile discord, from the words which were divinely inspired, let us take our expositions of questions* (d). It is a pittifull shift of *Bellarmines* to say

(a) *Ex 63.* οὐδὲν ἄτερ γραφῆς λέγομεν. *strom. lib. 6.*

(b) Δεῖ πᾶν ῥῆμα ἢ πρᾶγμα πιστοῦσθαι τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς. *in moralium summa definit. 26. cap. 1.* (c) Φανηρὰ ἔκπτωσις τῆς πίστεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ἐπεισάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων. *homil. de fide.* (d) *Evangelici libri sunt & Apostolici antiquiorumque Prophetarum sanctiones, quæ nos erudiunt quid de sacra lege sapiamus. Proinde hostili posita discordia ex verbis divinitus inspiratis sumamus quæstionum explicationes. Histor. tripartit, lib. 2. c. 6,*

that *Constantine was a better Emperour than Doctor*, whereas in this particular *Theodoret* assures us, that the whole Synod did highly approve of this saying, nor did any of the Antients ever condemn him for it. And indeed the practice of the Synod shews their approbation of the Speech, and consequently gives us another Argument, *for they determined the controversie according to the Scriptures* saies *Ambrose* (a): and *Athanasius* too, whose words are these, *The Bishops congregated at Nice, collecting together all things they could out of Scripture, to defend their opinion, they affirmed that the Son was consubstantial to the Father* (b). And *Bellarmine* himself confesseth it: *The Councel of Nice, when they defined the Son to be consubstantial to the Father, they drew their Conclusion out of the Scriptures* (c). Notable is that place of *Chrysostome*, because it acquaints us with his own judgment, and the judgment of the Christians of that Age, *If any thing be asserted* (saith he) *without Scripture, the mind of the Hearer wavers——But when Scripture comes, that confirmes the speakers words, and settles the Hearer's mind* (d). *Tertullian* thus confutes the opinion of *Hermogenes*, that things were made of præexistent matter, with, *I never read it, let* Hermogenes *shew where it is written, or else let him fear the woe denounced against those that adde to the Scriptures* (e). And again, *I do*

(a) *De fide ad Gratianum lib. 1. cap. 8.* (b) *Nicæ congregati Episcopi collectis in unum quæ ex sacris literis ad sententiam suam tuendam facerent——filium consubstantialem esse asseverant. In Epistola ad Epictetum.*

(c) *Concilium Nicenum cùm definivit filium Patri esse ὁμοούσιον conclusionem deduxit ex Scripturis. De Conciliis lib. 2. 12.*

(d) Εαν τι γὰρ ἄγραφον λέγεται ἢ διάνοια τῶν ἀκροατῶν σκάζει —*in Psal. 95.*——*nusquam adhuc legi.* c *Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus, aut detrahentibus destinatum. con. Hermogenem cap. 22.*

not receive what thou bringest of thy own without the Scripture [a]. And againe, *Take away from Hereticks the things they have in common with Heathens, that they may referre their questions to Scripture alone, and they can never stand* (b). But the Papists are of another mind, for if you will believe them, if Scripture alone must judge Controversies, Heresies will never fall. *Theodoret* professeth *he was not so bold as to assert any thing wherein the Scripture was silent* [c]. Thus *Origen. It is necessarie that we call in the Testimonie of Scripture, for without this our Expositions have no credit* [d]. *Austin* is most full and plaine, I will mention but one place, *Whether they have the Church they cannot shew but from the Canonical Books of Scripture.* And yet there is no question wherein Tradition seems more pertinent, and where the Papists urge it with more vehemency. I might adde a thousand pregnant places more, but either these or none will suffice to prove that the Antients did judge Scripture-proof necessary for the confirmation of any Doctrine in Religion, which the Romanists now judg not necessary. The Fathers pretended tradition for their opinion then, and the Papists pretend it now: Either tradition deceived the Fathers then, or it deceives Papists now: Either will serve our turn to shew the Fallibility of Tradition. If it be said there are no lesse expresse testimonies alledged by the Papists on the behalf of Tradition, and why should not they be received as well as those on the behalf of the Scripture.

(a) *Non recipio quod extra Scripturam de tuo infers, De carne Christi cap.7.* (b) *Aufer hæreticis quæ cum Ethnicis sapiunt, ut de solis Scripturis quæstiones suas sistant, & stare non possunt. De Resurrectione Carnis cap.3.* (c) οὐ γὰρ οὕτως εἰμὶ θρασὺς ὥστε φῆναι τι σεσιγημένον παρὰ τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ. *Dialog. 2.* (d) *Utrum ipsi Ecclesiam teneant non nisi Divinarum scripturarum Canonicis libris ostendant, de unitate Ecclesiæ cap.16.*

I Answer; 1. If the Fathers do in some places assert the sufficiency of proof from Tradition, and in other places the necessity of Scripture-proof; these assertions being directly contrary one to another, it invalidates their Authority in matters of Religion: For so say the Lawyers most justly and truly, *Testis pugnantia dicens fidem non facit.*

2. But upon enquiry it will be found in the places cited for Tradition (especially if you compare them with those alledged for Scripture) that they do plead Tradition onely as a secondary Argument to confirme that Faith which is grounded upon Scripture, but it is as clear as the Suone, that they ever made Tradition strike saile to the Scripture, and made no scruple of deserting Tradition when the evidence of Scripture Arguments stood on the other side.

Answ. 6. The Romanists themselves are undeniable instances of the vanity of their own Argument. They tell us Tradition cannot deceive us: Why, Tradition hath deceived them. There are diverse contradictory opinions maintained in the Church of *Rome*, about 300 are reckoned out of *Bellarmine*: the Dissenters, though never so implacably divided amongst themselves, doe agree in this, that they believe nothing but what hath come to them by Tradition from their Fathers, & so from the Apostles, then certainly either Tradition hath deceived some of them, or both the parts of a contradiction may be true. I shall not launch forth into the sea of Romish contradictions, nor take notice of pettie differences amongst obscure Authors, but shall instance in two material points, *viz.* the Doctrine of God's grace, and mans will, and the appurtenances as they are controverted between the *French* and *Italian* Papists: In both of them, it is as clear as the Sun, that both parties pretend Tradition. Now the Trumpet of Tradition gives an uncer-

tain

taine found, for Tradition tels the Jesuites this is truth, That the will is determined to good actions, not by Gods grace, but by its own inclination and agency: Tradition tels the Dominicans and Jansenists that this is a grosse falsity. So for the Church if you inquire in whom Supreme Authority and Infallibility resides (for that is the great question.) Tradition tels the Jesuites, it is in the Pope; Tradition not long since told the Councels of *Basil* and *Constance* that it was in a Councel, not in the Pope, and so it tells many of the French Doctors at this day. And (I will tell you a thing in your Eare) both these are Apostolical Traditions, though you and I think they are directly contrary. It is true that St. *James* saith, *No Fountain can yield both Salt water and fresh, Cha.*3.8.12. But that is to be understood onely of the Fountain of the Scripture, but the Fountain of Tradition can yield both Salt and fresh, both bitter and sweet. You may well allow Tradition to be Infallible, for you see it can work wonders, and reconcile contradictions. If this seem strange to you, you may expect the proof of it in an Appendix to the next Edition of Mr *Whites* Apology for Tradition, demonstrating that *Contradictoria possunt esse simul vera*, to be dedicated to the Defenders of Transubstantiation. But to return: What say our Masters to this difficulty? why, I will faithfully acquaint you where their strength lies, and what their pretences are: I find three things which are or may with some colour be said for them to safeguard the Infallibility of Tradition against this dreadfull shock.

2. They say these are onely Doctrines ventilated in Schools, not of any great consequence to Christians: Thus the controversies between the Jesuites and Dominicans about Gods free grace and mans free will (they say) are but Scholastical niceties, wherein the substance of Religion is not at all concerned: So for the point of Supremacy

Supremacy and Infallibility it is no great matter, *The dissenters only seek out the decider of Points of Doctrine, that is, by whose mouth we are to know, which be our Articles of Faith, whether by the Popes, or Councels, or both, which is not much material* (saith *Rushworths* second Edition *Dial.* 3. §. 9) *to our purpose what ever the truth be, supposing we acknowledge no Articles of Faith but such as have descended to us from Christ and his Apostles.*

For Answer, I would know whether a private Christian can infallibly know what are those Articles of Faith which came from Christ and his Apostles without the decision of Pope or Councel, or not. If they say he can know it, then it follows that private Christians may be infallible of themselves, and consequently there is no necessity of Pope or Councels, for what need any more then infallibility? If they say he cannot, then an infallible guide, judge, and interpreter is necessary to Tradition as well as to Scripture, and without this Tradition cannot make us infallible, and consequently, if it be doubtfull and disputable who this Judge is, it must be also doubtful whether the Tradition be right; and therefore Tradition cannot make me infallible. It is an audacity beyond parallel that they who make it so material as that they assert we have no certainty in our Faith for want of a decider of points of Doctrine, and make no scruple of sending us to Hell for want of such a Decider, should say this amongst themselves is not material, for (as to use and benefit) it is all one to have no decider of controversies, and not to be agreed who it is, according to that known maxime of the Lawyers, *Idem est non apparere & non esse*; As for the other points between the Jesuites and Dominicans, how material they are we will take their own judgments: If we may believe either one or other of them, the points are of great moment: If you aske the Jansenists or Dominicans their opinion of the Jesuiticall

Doctrine,

Doctrine, they tell you *that it is the very poison of the* Pelagian *Heresy, yea. it is worse then Pelagianisme, that they are contemners of Grace, such as rob God of his honour, taking half of it to themselves; that it is here disputed, Whether God alone be God, or whether the will of man be a kind of inferiour, yet (in part) an Independent Deity.* These are Mr *Whites* words in his *Sonus Buccinæ. quæst. Theolog. in Epist. & in parag.* 7.

And for the Jesuites they are not one jot behind hand with them in their censure of the Dominican Doctrine; which (say the Jesuites) brings back the stoical paradox, robs God of the Glory of his goodnesse, makes God a lyar and the Author of sinne; and yet when we tell them of these divisions, the breach is presently healed, these savages are grown tame, their differences trivial, and onely some School-niceties, wherein Faith is not concerned: And now both Stoicks and Pelagians are grown Orthodox, and the grace, glory, soveraignty and holinesse of God, are matters but of small concernment: and so it seems they are to them, else they durst not so shamelesly dally with them: But it is usuall with them to make the greatest points of Faith like Counters, which in computation sometimes stand for pounds, sometimes for pence, as interest and occasion require. And it is worth Observation, These very points of difference when they fall out among Protestants, between *Calvin* and *Arminius*, they are represented by our Adversaries as very material and weighty differences, but when they come to their share they are of no moment.

2. It may be said, Tradition may deceive some of the Romanists but not all: Now it is the Church which is said to be Infallible, not particular Doctors. For Answer, let it be remembred that I am not now speaking of the deception of some few private Doctors, but the points alledged are controverted amongst as learned and devout

devout men (as they call Devotion) as ever the Church of Rome had, here is Order against Order, University against Uuniversity, Nation against Nation, all of them pretending Tradition for their contrary opinions with greatest confidence and eagerneſſe. Premiſing this, I Anſwer, That Tradition which hath deceived thouſands of the beſt and Learneſt Romaniſts may deceive ten thouſand: That which deceives the Jeſuites in ſome points may deceive the Dominicans in others, the Franciſcans in others. If it deceive the French Papiſts in ſome points, it may deceive the Italians in other, and ſo is not Infallible in any: Or elſe, what bounds will theſe men ſet to the Infallibility of Tradition? Will they ſay Tradition is only infallible in *France*, and thoſe of the ſame perſwaſion, who plead Tradition for the Supremacy of the Councel above the Pope? Or will they ſay the Infallibility of Tradition is kept beyond the Alpes among the Italian Doctors, who urge Tradition for the Popes Supremacy above Councels? But what ſecurity will they give us, That the Fallibility of Tradition cannot paſſe over the Alpes, and get from one ſide to the other? Indeed Infallibility may happily be a tender piece not able to get over thoſe Snowy Mountains: But Fallibility can travel to all parts and at all times: In ſhort, it being certain that Tradition doth deceive thouſands of them, it may deceive the reſt. Nor can this be any way prevented, but by pretending the promiſe of Infallibility; but this is Heterogeneous to the preſent enquiry, and they are now pleading for another Infallibility from the nature of Tradition, and that is hereby diſproved; and for the fiction of a promiſe, I have diſcovered that before.

But the third and laſt pretence is moſt frequent; That however in leſſer points they may be miſtaken and divided, yet they are agreed in all that is *de fide*, in all points

of

of Faith, that is, in such things as have been decided by Pope or Councel: I answer in few words, and thus I reinforce my discourse. If Tradition might deceive them before such a Decision, it might deceive them afterwards; because the Decision of a Councel doth not alter the nature and property of Tradition. It is true (according to the opinion of some Papists) such a decision of a point may cause him to believe a Doctrine which before he doubted of or denied, because he may judge the Churches Authority so infallible and obliging to him, that Tradition with Scripture and all other things must strike saile to it: But the decision of a Councell cannot make that a Tradition, which was no Tradition, nor can it hinder, but that Tradition did deceive me before, and consequently might deceive me afterwards. For instance: If the Pope determine the controversie between the Jansenists and Jesuites about Predestination, Grace, Freewill, *&c.* his determination in favour of the Jesuites possibly may change some of the Jansenists judgments, because peradventure it is their principle that the Pope is the Infallible Judge of Controversies, to whom they must all submit. But (supposing that the Pope decides according to the verity of Tradition, and that must allwayes be supposed) a thousand of his decisions cannot hinder, but that all the Jansenists and Dominicans had untill that time been deceived by Tradition. So it seems Tradition in that point was Fallible for above 1600 years together after Christ, and now upon the Popes determination *An.* 1653. it is *momento turbinis* grown Infallible; but neither will this do their work; for the nature of Tradition being the same, either it must be infallible in the foregoing ages, or else it must now be acknowledged Fallible.

§. 11. *Ans.* 7. Although this one Answer might suffice to all their perplexing arguments tending to shew the impossibility

possibility of any mutation or corruption where Tradition is pretended, *viz.* that its apparent, there have been several mutations and corruptions where Tradition is owned: As it was a sufficient confutation of that Philosophers knotty Arguments alledged to prove that there was no motion, when his Adversary walked before him; though happily the other brought some Arguments that might puzzle an able disputant to Answer, (which in that point is not hard to doe:) Or if any man should urge a subtile Argument to prove the impossibility of Sins comming into the World, because neither could the understanding be first deceived, nor the will corrupted without the deception of the understanding, it were sufficient to alledge the universal experience of mankind to the contrary: So the undoubted experience of manifest corruptions in the Church so called, which no man that hath the use of his Eyes, and exercise of his reason or conscience can be ignorant of, might justly silence all the cavils of wanton wits pretending to prove the impossibility of it: yet because I will use all possible means to convince them, if God peradventure may give some of them repentance that they may recover themselves from the snare of the Divell, I shall proceed farther and easily evince the possibility of corruption in that case, and point at some of those many fountaines of corruption, from whence the streams of errour might flow into the Church, notwithstanding the pretence of, and adherence to the Doctrine of Tradition. And because the answerer of the L. *Falkland* reduceth all to two branches: *If* (saith he) *a company of Christians pretending Tradition for all they teach, could teach falshoods, then some age must either have erred in understanding their Ancestors, or have joyned to deceive their posterity, but neither of these are credible.* I shall apply my Answer to him, first in general, and then to the several branches of his Argument.

§. 12.

§. 12. In general, the whole Argument is built upon a false supposition, as if the misunderstanding or deceit must needs come in as it were in one spring tide, as if it were impossible that the Tares of Errour should be sowne in the Church while men slept and never dreamed of it: The basis of this Argument lies in an assertion of the impossibility of that, which the nature of it shewes to be most rational and probable, and the experience of all ages shewes to be most usuall, *i.e.* that corruption of Doctrines and manners (for in this both are alike) should creep in by degrees. As *Jason's* ship was wasted (so Truth was lost) one piece after another: *Nemo repente fit turpissimus*: Who knowes not that errours crept into the Jewish Church gradually, and why might it not be so in the Christian Church? We know very well, *Posito uno absurdo sequuntur multa*: One error will breed an hundred, yet all its Children are not borne in one day; St *Paul* tels us *the mistery of iniquity began to work in his daies*, but was not brought to perfection till many ages after. The Apostle hath sufficiently confuted this senceless fancy, whilest he tels us that Heresy *eats like a canker or a gangreen, i.e.* by degrees, and is not worst at first, but *encreaseth to more ungodlin sse*, 2 Tim. 2. 16, 17. As that cloud, which at first appearance was no bigger than a mans hand, did gradually outspread the whole face of the Heavens, so those opinions which at first were onely the sentiments of the lesser part, might by degrees improve and become the greater, or at least by the favour of Princes, or power & learning of their advocates, become the stronger until at last, like *Moses's* Rod they devoured the other Rods, & monopolizing to themselves the liberty of writing and professing their Doctrines, and suppressing all contrary Discourses and Treatises, their Doctrines being propoled by them as Catholick doctrines, and the Doctrines of their own and former ages (which

was

was frequently pretended by several Hereticks) and this propositon not contradicted by considerable persons, (which in some Ages were few, and those easily byassed) or the contradiction being speedily suppressed, (which is very possible and hath been usual) it could not probably fall out otherwise, but that their opinion should be transmitted to their Successors for the Faith of their Age. Rome was not built in a day, neither in a civil, nor in a Spiritual notion. And *de facto*, that corruptions did creep into the Church of Rome by degrees, hath been so fully demonstrated, that I need onely point the Reader to those Authors who have done this work, especially to *Mornay's* mystery of Iniquity, and the excellent defence of it in French by *Rivet* against the cavils of *Coffeteam*.

2. I answer particularly, and in opposition to the first branch, I lay down this position: That the following Age, or the Major part of those called Christians, might easily mistake the minde of the foregoing Age, of which many rational accounts may be given. 1. There was no certain way, whereby (for example) the particular Christians of the third Age, might infallibly know the Doctrines which were delivered by the whole Church of the second Age. Remember the question is not how probably they might believe, but how infallibly they might know it, for nothing will serve the Romanists turn short of infallibility. It is true, the Christians of *Antioch* might know what their Fathers delivered to them there, and they of *Ephesus* what was there deliverd, but no Christian could without miracles infallibly know, what were the Doctrines delivered to the Christians in those innumerable places where the Gospel had got footing. Hence then I offer this Argument: Either this is sufficient for the infallibility of Tradition, that the Christians in several Cities and places did understand what their Ancestours taught in such places, and would not deceive

ceive their poſterity in it, or it is not ſufficient, but it is neceſſary that Traditions ſhould be compared, and the Truth diſcovered in a general Councel. If they ſay the former, then they aſſert the Infallibility, not onely of the Church or Biſhop of *Rome*, or of a general Councel, or of the Catholick Church, but of every particular City: And to ſay truth, either this plea of Tradition is fallacious and abſurd, or every particular Church is Infallible. For (to uſe their own words) if the Chriſtians (ſuppoſe of *Epheſus*) could be deceived, then either they did not underſtand the Doctrine of their Anceſtors there delivered, or they did willingly deceive their poſterity; but neither of theſe were poſſible: *Ergo*, the Church of *Epheſus* was infallible. If they will eat their own words, (as they will do any thing ſooner then retract their errors and return to the Truth,) and ſay the Church of *Epheſus* might miſunderſtand their Anceſtors or deceive their poſterity, then ſo might the Church of *Antioch* and that of *Alexandria*, and ſo the reſt, and what then becomes of Infallibility? If they ſay the latter, *viz.* That there is a neceſſity of a general Councel to compare Traditions, and declare the Truth, then they are deſired to remember, that as yet there had been no general Councel, and conſequently no Infallibility, and therefore in that Age there might be a miſunderſtanding, yea many miſtakes. What elſe will they ſay? will they ſay that a Chriſtian might infallibly know the Truth by travelling to all places and companies of Chriſtians, and hearing it from their own mouths? This, though it might give ſatisfaction to ſuch a Chriſtian, yet it could not ſatisfie others who had no ſuch evidence. Or will they ſay the Chriſtians knew it by Teſtimonies received from every Church, and particular recitals of their Traditions? Why, ſuch Teſtimonials are not ſo much as pretended to have been required, or given, and if they had been

given, yet that could satisfie none, but those few eyewitnesses of them. It remaines therefore that there was no way whereby the Christians of the third Age might be assured of the genuine Traditions of the second, (which was the thing to be proved.) And the solidity and satisfactorinesse of this one Answer, (if there were no more) appeares plainly from hence, that the great Architects of this devise make it essential to such a Tradition that it come from all the Apostles, so Mr *White* informes us since *all Catholicks, when they speak of Tradition deliberately and exactly, define it to be a Doctrine universally taught by the Apostles, we may safely conclude, where two Apostles teach differently, neither is Tradition. Apol. for Trad. Encount. 6.* And elsewhere his reply to our instance of the Tradition of communicating infants is this, *That it was a Tradition begun by some Apostles, not all, in some countries, not all. Encounter 2.* Hence then I thus argue, The following Christians could have no assurance what Doctrine was taught by all the Apostles without a general Councel of all the Churches, severally taught by the several Apostles; but such a general Councel there was none in the third Age: therefore the third age could not infallibly understand the Apostolical Traditions delivered in the second, which was the thing to be proved.

§. 14. 2. There are many instances which may be given of mens misunderstanding the Doctrines of the preceding age. We have one instance among our selves, concerning the judgment of the Church of *England* of the next preceding Age in the Quinquarticular points: The favourers of *Arminius* his Doctrines tell us, that she maintained their Doctrines; Their Adversaries tell us, she held the contrary: and there are Books written, and Arguments urged on both sides. He that doubts of this, let him look into Mr. *Prin* on the one side, and Dr *Heylin* on the other. And why might it not be thus in

in former ages? And seeing there are great mistakes daily committed, and fresh disputes managed, about the opinions of those Authors, who have left us their mind (as plainly as words can make it) in books, which are alwaies present to our perusal; how can it be sense for a man to say, that one may infallibly know their mind by a transient hearing of them? What tedious controversies are there about the judgment of S. *Augustine*, and others of the Fathers, in sundry points of great moment, wherein they have as fully explained themselves as any Preacher can do, or useth to do? Suppose now the Fathers preach the same things and words which they have left us in writings, (and diverse of their works were no other than their Sermons) can any man without non-sence say, that the diligent Reader may be mistaken, and the attentive Hearer is infallible? We all know the five Propositions of *Jansenius* condemned lately at *Rome*. The Jansenists deny that to be the sense of *Jansenius* his words, which the Pope and the Jesuites affix to them: both parties are agreed in his words, (which seldome happens in Oral Traditions, and consequently make the argument stronger) yet they differ in the sense, which one side saith is Heretical, the other aver it is innocent. Why might not in like manner several parties, though it be supposed they perfectly remembred the words delivered by *Peter* in a Sermon 20 years before, (which I would not grant but that it is a work of charity to help the weak) what hinders but that they may understand them in contrary senses, and so derive from them contrary conclusions, and yet both pretend to assert nothing but the doctrine delivered from S. *Peters* mouth? Are there not sharp contests among Popish Authors about the opinion of the Councel of *Trent* in diverse points, and that too among those who were present upon the place, and heard their debates? And will these men still undertake to prove that

Snow is black, or (which is equivalent to it) that it was impossible to do that which is usually done, *viz.* to mistake the doctrines of the former age? Let us consider one scripture instance. S. *Paul* tels us, *a man is justified by faith without the works of the law*, and that *Abraham was thus justified*: the Papists remember the words, but mistake the sence. Now put case S. *Paul* had preached the same words (as he did unquestionably the same thing) which he wrot, who can say (that hath any care what he saith) that they that mistook the sense of those words when they read them in a book, could not as easily have mistaken them, when they heard them from his mouth? Especially if it be considered, that S. *James* preached, and wrot a Doctrine in words seemingly contrary to these. My Question now is, what should hinder, that the several hearers of those Apostles, perfectly remembring their various expressions, might not derive contrary Traditions from them? why might not the one side have apprehended *Paul* as excluding all works in the Protestant sense from Justification, and the other have understood *James* (as the Papists at this day do) as conjoyning faith and works in justification? And if this cannot be denied, then it followes unavoidably, that errors may come into the Church under pretence of Tradition, which was the thing to be proved. Another instance we have in the Sadduces, whose error is reported to have come into the world under the colour of Tradition: for when *Antigonus Socheus* a Master in Israel, was teaching, that if there was no future reward, no immortality of the Soul, no resurrection of the body, yet we ought to serve God: his scholar *Sadok* so mis-understood him, that he broached a new doctrine, and turned his Hypothetical Proposition into a Categorical, and asserted, that there was no resurrection of the body, nor immortality of the soul, *&c.* And will these men pawn their souls on it, that it was impossible for the Apostles hea-

hearers to commit the same mistakes in the doctrines they heard from their mouthes? Hath not S. *John* given us an instance of easinesse and earlinesse of such mistakes in *Joh.* 21. where, upon that expression of Christ's concerning *John*, *If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?* The Evangelist observes, that a Tradition was delivered *among the brethren, that that Disciple should not dye*, vers. 22, 23. In a word, if it be so familiar a thing (as daily experience shews) for common hearers to misunderstand the words and mistake the sense of a preacher, when they are but newly come from him, and all things are fresh in their memory, what a desperate assertion is this, that a man can certainly remember the words, and infallibly understand the sense of those Sermons he heard from his former Ministers it may be twenty years ago? And if it be granted (as it cannot be denied) that the hearers of the second age might mistake the doctrines delivered by the teachers of the foregoing age in some things; why might not the hearers of the third age mistake their predecessors in other things, and so of the fourth, and further, untill at last the systeme of Divinity came to that ruthful habit in which it is delivered in the Church of *Rome?* To clear this further, consider what I have already intimated.

§. 15. 3. The words of our predecessors may be remembred, & yet the sense wonderfully perverted. Now as it is not words, but the sense of them wherein the soul lies, so all or most of the controversies in the Church are about the sense of words. And in this, Scripture and Tradition are equally lyable to the same fate, the words may be agreed on, & the controversie arise solely about the sense of them. For example, the Tradition of the first age was this, That God alone was to be worshipped, not men, not Angels, not Images. Nor is it possible that any man should expresse his mind more plainly and positively than

the Fathers unanimously did in this particular. Now comes the next age, and they receive indeed this Tradition, but then here ariseth a question, In what sense they said God alone was to be worshipped? St *Austin* takes it up, and saith, they meant that God alone was to be worshipped with *Latria*, and the saints with *Dulia*. And although it is evident enough, that by *Dulia* St *Austin* meant nothing but a Civil worship (because he ascribes it to the living as well as the dead, and when he takes *Dulia* for a religious worship, he appropriates it to God [a],) yet this unhappy distinction falling into the hands of his perverse successors, gave rise to another controversie, *viz.* in what sense S. *Austin* ascribes *Dulia* to the creature? And thus, as in the throwing of a stone upon the water, one circle begets another; so doth one controversie ingender another, and every one of them is a convincing evidence of the fallibility of Tradition. Take one instance more. St *Gregory* the great Pope, delivers this doctrine to posterity, as his doctrine, and the doctrine of his Ancestors, that *whosoever calls himself Universal Bishop, is proud, profane, abominable, wicked, blasphemous, and the forerunner of Antichrist.* This is confessed. Now *Gregory*'s successors have an itch after the name and thing of Universal Bishop: in order to this they start a question (where indeed there was none to men that had either science or conscience,) *viz.* In what sence *Gregory* condemned this Title of Universal Bishop? For this is a Maxime, let the Pope speak what words he please, the sense is alwaies orthodox. Oh, say these Sophi, *John of Constantinople called himself Universal Bishop, as if he were the onely Bishop, and all others but his Vicars, and that they must not so much as have the name of Bishop*, a sense that poor *John* never

(a) *Qu.* 94. *in Exodum.*

dreamed

dreamed of, nor any man of that age (for then surely *Anastasius* the Patriarch of *Antioch*, and *Mauritius* the Emperour would never have written to *Gregory*, (as they did) that it was but a frivolous thing that *John* desired:) so now by this ingenious device, here comes in a new, contrary, and that too (forsooth) a Catholick Tradition, *viz.* That the Pope is, and ever ought to be, and ever was Universal Bishop. But whether the Popish glosse be sound or rotten, it equally serves my purpose, which is to shew how controversies may arise about the sense, and errors come in at that door, though Tradition hath made a true report of the words, which it seldome doth. I might multiply instances, but these will suffice for a candid Adversary, and others nothing will suffice.

§. 16. 4. This will be made more probable, if you consider the quality of some former ages, which might and did give great advantage to errour to creep in under the mask of Tradition, and consequently evinceth how easie it was for one age to mistake the doctrines of the preceding age. To this end consider with me the condition of the Tenth age, of which I shall desire you to judg according to the testimony of their own Authors. The words of *Baronius* are these. *In the nine hundreth year of Christ, the third Indiction, a new age begins, which by reason of its asperity and barrennesse of good is wont to be called the Iron Age; from the deformity of abounding wickednesse, the Leaden; and from the scarcitie of writers, the abscure age*[a]. And *Genebrard*, though according to the manner of the Beast, he chargeth it upon the *Lutherans*, that they onely call it *saeculum infelix*, an unhappy age, yet he

(a) *Anno Christi nongentesimo, Indictione tertia, novum inchoatur saeculum, quod sui asperitate ac boni levilitate Ferreum, malique exundantis deformitate Plumbeum, atque inopia Scriptorum appellari consuevit Obscurum. ad An.* 900.

elsewhere forgets himself (therein the more inexcusable, because he was one of them who ought to have good memories) and in his Chronology plainly tels us, *This is called the unhappy age, being barren of ingenious and learned men* [a]: and he tels you, that the Popes of that age (the principal conservators of Tradition, and the subjects of Infallibility) *had altogether fallen from the virtue of their Ancestors, and were rather Apostates then Apostles* [b]. Can any man doubt of the power of Papist to make a Transubstantiation, when we see with our eyes that they can turn every piece of wood into an infallible Doctor? I think I need say nothing for the confutation of Mr. *Whites* argument, but barely repeat it, that the Reader may compare it with the state of this age, It is this: The whole Church, or major part of it in every age were so knowing, that they infallibly understood all the doctrines of the foregoing age, and so carefull and pious, that they would not deceive themselves, nor their posterity. Answer the Argument I need not, but only observe three things in this age, which will prove ὁδυναμοφανές not onely the possibility but a great probability both of mistaking their Ancestors, and of deceiving themselves and their posterity. 1. Ignorance. 2. Carelesness and Profaneesse. 3. Scarcity of Writers. No man can judg infallibility to such an age, unless he will offer violence to all his rational powers.

§. 17. 1. There was a grosse ignorance in the generality of the Clergy, the Popes themselves not excepted. *The whole world was overspread with darkness, as thick as that in Ægypt*, saith *Baronius* [c]. *It is reported, that at that*

a *Infelix dicitur hoc seculum, exhaustum hominibus ingenio & doctrina claris. In Chronol.*

b *Pontifices à majorum virtute defecerunt, Apostatici Apostaticive potiùs quàm Apostolici. ib.*

c *Orbis terræ totus tenebris fuit offusus, Peccatorum fuit caligo, Ægypti pene tenebras superans. in An. 974.*

time

time there were no publick Schools, ſaith *Carolus Sigonius* a. And the *Synodus Rhemenſis*, cited by *Baronius*, plainly ſay, *that at that time, it was reported, that there were ſcarce any learned men at Rome* b. He that ſaith ſo ignorant an age could not miſtake, muſt needs be in a dream, and when he awakes I ſhall give him further anſwer. If any prudent man (who will not ſuffer his eyes like *Sampſons* to be put out, that he may grind in the Pope's mill) reflect upon the ſtate of ſome ignorant Country congregation among us, if he pleaſe to examine them, he ſhall find them ſo farre from underſtanding infallibly the doctrines delivered by their Anceſtors and former Miniſters 20 or 30 years before, that they do not underſtand the opinions of their own age, no nor ſo much as thoſe which their miniſters (though an able painful and plain Preacher, ſuch as were very few in that age, hath been preaching upon for divers years together. And yet (forſooth) a company of ſuch men as theſe (by Mr. *White*'s argument) are free from all poſſibilities of miſtakes what were the doctrines delivered by the age before them.

§. 18. 2. There was an univerſal careleſneſſe and profaneneſſe upon mens ſpirit. Neither Miniſter nor people did much buſy their heads about ſuch matters, but minded only the advancement of *their ſecular intereſt, and the pampering of their bellies*, (ſay their own Hiſtorians:) the Clergy then were univerſally negligent in teaching and inſtructing the people, (whoſe ignorance they ſaw moſt ſerviceable to their deſigns) and the people were as careleſſe to underſtand the concernments of religion. And if this very careleſneſs and profaneſſe did utterly

a *Scholæ publicæ nullæ tum fuiſſe produntur, De regno Italiæ c.7.*

b *Cum hoc tempore Romæ nullus pene ſit (ut fama eſt) qui literas didicerit. Baronius. An. 992.*

looſe

lose and extinguish all the sentiments and doctrines of true religion, delivered by *Adam* and *Noah*, in their posterity, why might it not be so after Christ's time? Mr. *White* and his Partisans venture their salvation upon the truth of this absurd Proposition: That it was impossible the same cause should produce the same effects. Nor is it to any purpose that *Rushworth* alledgeth to prove the disparity, viz. *That onely one man and one woman were witnesse of those high wonders (whereas the Gospel had innumerable miracles witnessed to multitudes of people in diverse countries) that the hearers could hardly believe them, that they had but a sleight care of recommending God's service to their children, and that they were taken up with the world's plantation, and other secular affairs: and there was no set form and institutions of Priests and governours to joyne all nations in communion, no chief Bishop* &c. Dialo. 3 §. 15. For 1. supposing that (which Divines generally believe) *viz.* that Adam truly repented of his sin; it is contrary to common sense to believe, that he who had such a fresh knowledge and lively sense of the difference between highest felicity and utmost miserie, should be careless in the concernments of religion; that he that had been the happy instrument of ruining all his posterity, should not use all possible diligence to heal the wound himself had made; and with greatest instances and importunities indeavour the perpetuation of religion to his posterity. 2. It is false to say there were then no Priests, no chief Bishop to take care of religion: for though there were none that had the names, yet there were that had the office, and did the work, *viz.* the heads of families, and especially the great & common Father & Universal Bishop of all mankind. And it is both against reason, & experience, & charity, to think this natural Bishop would take less care of the conservation of religion among his own natural children than the Bishop of *Rome* would do among his titular relations

lations. 3. As for the wonders of the Creation, they were so great and glorious and innumerable, and at that time so evident and unquestionable, that it is the greatest wonder of all how they could disbelieve them, or so soon wear out the memory of them; especially when *Adam* lived above 600 years to demonstrate the verity and inculcate the story of them, whereas the Apostles were dead, & all the eye witnesses of their miracles in a fourth part of that time. In a word though it be easy in this, and all other resemblances, to devise several dissimilitudes and disproportions, yet in the main there is an agreement, that the carelesness of posterity may blast the most powerful and important Traditions. If it be further pretended, that there is a disparity, because God hath promised his spirit to guide the Christians into truth, and to preserve them from mistake: I shall only say two things having fully answered this before. 1. Whatever promise or priviledge of the Spirit is made to Christians, surely it is a most absurd and unreasonable thing, to pretend the donation of this priviledge, and the performance of this promise unto such, as we have now described, concerning whom the Scripture expressly tels us, *that they are sensual, not having the spirit*, Jude v. 19. and *they cannot receive the spirit of God*, Joh. 14 17. Where the spirit of God is, it brings light with it, it turns men from darkness into a marvellous light, it rouseth men out of the sleep of carelesness, and makes them give all diligence to make their calling and election sure. And therefore where ignorance and profaneness are allowed and predominant, (as apparently they were in this age) we may safely say, such have not the Spirit of Christ dwelling in them, *for where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty*, especially that which is the principal part of it, a liberty from the bondage of sin and Satan, by whom that Age was so wofully captivated, that we need not many arguments to shew,

that

that they were not influenc'd by Gods Spirit, but acted by the rulers of the darkeneſs of this world, the ſpirit that now worketh in the Children of diſobedience. 2. This is impertinent to the preſent argument, which is drawn not from the efficacy of a divine promiſe, but from the nature of the thing, and the common prudence of men, and that natural principle of ſelf preſervation (as you will plainly ſee, if you look back upon Mr *Whites* words.) This argument proceeds as if it were morally impoſſible for men wilfully to deceive themſelves and their poſterity, which is not from the influence of a divine promiſe, but from an inſtinct of nature, and ſo this evaſion is ſufficient. To return therefore (having removed this rub out of the way) and to make good what I have ſaid concerning the carelelneſs and wickedneſſe of the age, that this diſeaſe had overſpread the whole body Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, the Pope himſelf not excepted, you ſhall hear from the approved Authors of the Romiſh Church. *Platina* calls ſeveral of thoſe Popes, *Monſtra & portenta hominum*, monſters of men. *John* 11th is called by Cardinal *Baronius* (one who we may be ſure, would do the Popes no wrong and the Proteſtant no right) *rather a defiler than ruler of the Roman ſeat* (a). *They were prodigious Popes*, ſaith *Gembrardus* (b). Pope *Sergius*, ſaith *Baronius*, was *a ſlave of all vices, and the wickedſt of men* (c). And of *John* the 10th he ſaith, *Than whom none was more filthy* (d). And ſuch characters they give to diverſe of the Popes of that age: and theſe are ſupreme Heads of the Church, the prime ſubjects and fountaines of Infallibility, and con-

(a) *Sedis Apoſtolicæ inquinator potius, quam rector ad an* 936.
(b) *Pontifices iſti prodigioſi erant. ad an* C. 913.
(c) *Sergius erat vitiorum omnium ſervus, facinoroſiſſimus omnium ad An.* 908.
(d) *Quo turpior fuit nullus,*

formable

formable to the head were the generality of the members of that politick body, the ministers and governours, (as well as the people) of that age, as you hear acknowledged by their own most approved Authors. Now compare this with their argument for Tradition, and you will be able to judge of the solidity of it. The two Pillars upon which the Infallibility of the argument from Tradition is built, are these, (I shall give you them in the words of *Rushworth* in his applauded Dialogues 3. §. 15. 1.) *It was no hard matter for the Church to conserve the truth of her doctrine, if she were carefull; which histories plainly bear witnesse she was. 2. That nature forceth men to have care of Religion, and therefore it was impossible any errour should creep into the Church.* And elsewhere saith he, *Nature permits not men to be sleepy in Religion*, §. 8. To which discourse I reply three things, which plainly evince the folly of this opinion. 1. That the Infallibility of Tradition by these Arguments depends upon the Faith of some few Historians, whom all confess to be fallible, which is a contradiction. 2. That the supposed carefulness (upon which the Infallibility of Tradition depends) being the effect of that nature which is equally in all men, if it make any person or Councel infallible, it must make every particular Church, nay every Christian infallible, (at least such as have common knowledge and prudence in them:) 3. Observe the impudence of this sort of men, that dare avouch those Histories for witnesses of the Churches care, which have so expressly and unanimously recorded her carelesness both in this and other ages. See *ch.* 4.

§. 19. 3 There is another thing very considerable in this matter, *viz.* There was a great scarcity of writers, which cuts the sinewes of that grand objection which they urge in all their Treatises; That there could be no change in doctrine without schism and a notorious tumult as *White* saith:) and they prove there was no change, because

we

we cannot shew the Authors, times, and place of them. (As if one that had got the plague, may say he is free from it, because he knowes not how, nor where, nor from whom he got it.) Now here appears the unreasonableness of their demand, and the absurdity of their argument; how can it be expected that we should give an account of all the occurrences and mutations of that age, when they confesse so few books were written, and those that were, were written by such as were either wholly, or in part leavened with the corruption of the time, and therefore (for their own honour) obliged to conceal all such changes and defections, as themselves had an hand in. And if any reputed Heretick durst venture to betray any of the secrets of the mystery of iniquity which was then working, his book was presently suppressed, and he and it both confuted by an argument fetched out of the Fire, or rather thrown into it. So the Papists do by us, if as a man should blow out all the Lights, and then blame me for not finding what I was making inquest after; or as if one should burn my principal evidence, and then charge me that I cannot make out my Title. And yet notwithstanding all the frauds and force of the Romish Sea, God hath not left his Truth without witnesse, nor us without notable Testimonies, even from among themselves, of the successive depravations and corruptions in Religion by them foisted into the Church: but that hath been fully proved by others, and therefore I shall say nothing of it. I shall adde onely this, that although I have instanced but in one age, yet indeed there were several other ages overspread with the same deluge of ignorance, and carelesnesse, and loosnesse, and consequently lyable to the same mistakes: such as the age before the reformation of Religion was, and diverse others, wherein learned men were thought to be Conjurers, and reading of Greek was counted as hard as the quadrating of a Circle, and

skill

skill in the learned languages made a man half an Heretick: and this all Records are full of. I think I need say no more to prove the first branch, *viz.* That it was possible for some Ages, or the major part of them to mistake the mind of their Predecessors in matters of Religion. But I must not omit Mr *Whites* animadversion upon this consideration which he cals a *ridiculous cavil, and a slander so palpably absurd, that he can scarce perswade himself to think they that use it are not rather blinded with malice than ignorance.* You will easily judge his reason runs low, because his passion flies so high: and what is the reason of this clamor? why (saith he) *The Protestants acknowledge the doctrines of the Romane Church (which they call errors) were already flourished some hundreds of years before these times of ignorance.* Apolog. for Tradition, Encounter 1. Shall I return Mr *White* his own language? What shall I ascribe this intolerable mistake to? shall I attribute it to his ignorance? I cannot tell how to do so to one of his parts and reading. Dare he say that all the present doctrines of the Church of *Rome* were flourishing some hundreds of years before the tenth age, whose ignorance I have represented and proved? Or if he say and think so, yet dare he say the Protestants are of this mind, if he ever looked into any Protestant Author? Is it not evident to the whole world, that the Protestats do both universally deny, and solidly disprove this audacious assertion, and evidently prove (even by the suffrages of learned Papists) the far later novelty of many of their errors? Shall I then ascribe it to his malice? I am loth to do so: although none more frequently guilty of that crime, than they that most boldly charge it upon others. One may by this and such like passages imagine, how vain a thing it is, to expect sincerity & honesty from these men in the handling of controversies, when such a one as Mr *White*, (a person of more repute for candour and ingenuity than

most

most of their writers) shall not fear to assert in Print in the face of all the Protestant world. That *the Protestants do boldly acknowledg the Roman Church hath had universal Tradition for the whole body of its faith, ever since* S. Gregories *dayes, which is now a thousand years!* than which nothing can be said more notoriously false, and monstrously absurd. But again, suppose the age most famous for its ignorance were after S. *Gregorie's* dayes, who knowes not (that is not a meer stranger to all Antiquity and Ecclesiastical History) that there was in some ages before S. *Gregory*, at least among the generality of Christians and many Ministers, so much ignorance, as might easily betray them to mistakes in several doctrines, and pretended Traditions? And finally, if all he aims at were granted, it signifies not much, and cannot pretend to prove any more than this, That in the first ages errors did not creep in at the door; which may be granted without any considerable prejudice to the Protestant assertion, since in other ages most of their great errors might come in that way, and in all ages they might come in several other wayes.

§. 20. The second Branch is this. That as some ages might mistake the doctrines of their Fathers so they might knowingly deliver to their posterity, not the doctrine they received from their Ancestors, but some other; and of this many reasons may be given, but I shall confine my self to three.

§. 21. 1. It might be from Gods just judgment, giving men up to believe what was false, *viz.* That such doctrines did come from the Apostles by their Ancestors which indeed did not. Nay, what these men would needs perswade us was impossible, the Holy Ghost hath assured us is certain and sure, 2 Thes. 2. 10, 11, 12. *Because they received not the truth in the love of it, God shall send strong delusions, that they should believe a lye*: a place more considerable, because it is particularly levelled at the Romish faction

faction (as might be evidently shewed, if it were not extravagant from my present business.) That the character here described suits with the quality of diverse ages forementioned, *viz.* that they were such, as did not receive the truth in the love of it, that they had pleasure in unrighteousnesse, he that reviews what hath been here said, will find no cause to doubt: and therefore that the judgment here denounced should be inflicted upon them, is no more than what might be expected from the faithfulnesse of God, and the usual course of his providence. And if they might believe other lies of greater importance, and most dangerous consequence, why might they not believe such a lye as this, *viz.* That a Doctrine came from the Apostles, which indeed did not? And because the generality of the forementioned ages, the Clergy and Popes not excepted, were apparently guilty of the sins here deciphered, and consequently obnoxious to the judgment here predicted, therefore it is intolerable impudence to assert, that those men were infallibly guided into all truth, whom that God, who cannot lye, hath threatned to give up to believe lies, of which this is not the least considerable and dreadful, to believe such persons to be infallible.

§. 22. 2. The greatest part of the Church in one age might knowingly recede from the doctrine of their immediate Ancestors, and deliver another doctrine to their posterity; because they might believe that the Churches and Fathers of the next foregoing age might fall into some errours: for that which is actually believed by Protestants now, might possibly be believed by the Fathers then: *Ab esse ad posse valet argumentum.* And this is sufficient for the answer of this argument, and the defence of our cause: but *ex abundanti* I adde, that *de facto*, this was the faith of the greatest part of the Church and writers in some ages, as I have already shewed out

of undeniable testimonies. To which I shall onely adde 2 or 3 passages out of *Cyprian*, by which the Reader may evidently discern, how little weight was then laid upon (that which is now said to be infallible) Tradition, and the testimonie of the present Church. Tradition indeed was the plea urged by the Bishop of *Rome* against *Cyprian* and the *African Bishops*: now mark what the reply is. Two things *Cyprian* answers: 1. *That they of Rome did not observe all antient Traditions, and this* (saith he) *appears from their opinion about Easter*: which, by the way, discovers the vanity of that supposition, which they lay as a basis of the present position, *viz.* That the Church of *Rome* delivers nothing, but what she professeth to have received from her Ancestors. 2. He answers, That *this was but a humane Tradition, and therefore not infallible*[a]. And It is considerable, that he writes thus to the Pope, by which we may sufficiently understand what was *Cyprians* judgment, and the faith of that age concerning the infallibility of Tradition, as also of the Pope, and Church of *Rome*. And conformable to *Cyprians* was the decision of the whole Councel of *Carthage*, *When truth is manifest*, (say they) *let custome yield to truth; and although hitherto none did baptize Hereticks in the Church, now let them begin to baptize them*[b]. And in another place *Cyprian* speaking of the custome of mixing wine and water in the Sacrament, hath these words: *Nor should any one think that the custome of some is to be followed, for we are to enquire whom they followed, for onely Christ is to be followed*: and he adds, *that we are not to regard what others have done before us, but what Christ, who is before all, first did; for we*

a *Epist. 74. ad Pompeium fratrem.*

b *Veritate manifestata cedat consuetudo veritati, ut etsi in præteritum, quis in Ecclesia hæreticos non baptizabat, nunc baptizare incipiat.* Opera Cypriani per Pamelium p. 402.

must

must not follow mens customes, but Gods Truth[a]. And in another place he positively asserts, that *when any thing is out of order, the onely way to be satisfied is to go to the fountain, to the head and original of Divine Tradition, to Evangelical and Apostolical Tradition*[b]. From all which it undeniably followes, that *Cyprian* and his brethren did not judge the Tradition of the next preceding Age infallible, nor the Testimony of the present Church sufficient (as these Gentlemen now do) and consequently thought it might introduce opinions contrary to what they received from their Ancestors, when by these allegations it appears as plainly, as if it were written with a Sun-beam, they judged it liable to mistakes and errors; and this is the very Doctrine of the Protestants.

§. 23. 3. There might be an agreement and design amongst many persons and eminent members of the Church, to corrupt the Doctrine received from their Ancestors for their worldly interest and carnal ends, of which almost all Ages afford us woful and innumerable instances. With the Readers leave I will exemplifie this Proposition in a notorious instance, in a Doctrine of great concernment, (which is the *prora & puppis*, the foundation stone and corner stone of the Romish Religion, and if you will take *Bellarmines* word, necessary to Salvation) I mean the Pope's Supremacy. I beg the Readers pardon, if I do a little more largely insist upon it, than my manner is, because the story is remarkable, and strikes at the root of this novel conceit, concerning the impossibility of a wilful deception. Mr *White* tels us, the Church cannot be deceived in Tradition, and especially the Church and

a *Non est quod existimet aliquis sequendam esse quorundam consuetudinem, quærendum est enim quem ipsi sunt secuti. —— Nam non nisi Christus sequendus est. —— Non debemus attendere quid alius ante nos faciendum putaverit &c.* Epist. 63. b Ep. 74.

Bishop of *Rome* (who by the consent of all the Papists have been the most faithful conservators of Tradition.) The Papists generally agree, that they have an Authentick and universal Tradition on the behalf of the Popes Supremacy, of which the right appeales is a principal branch, and the greatest evidence. And this Tradition (say they) came to them from the Apostles by the Fathers of all ages successively. Well then, to come to the story. In the year 417. there was a famous Councel at *Carthage*, (owned by *Bellarmine* and *Baronius* by the name of *The general Councel at Carthage*) consisting of 217 Bishops, among whom was *Alypius* and St. *Austin*, *Zosimus* being Pope at that time sends his Legates thither, and pretends a right of appeales from the *African* Churches to himself at *Rome*, and to make this good she alledgeth for it some of the Canons of the Councel of *Nice*, for he ascends no higher, the more silly wretch he! For if the Doctrine of the present Church of Rome be true, he might have brought that, which was more evident and irresistible than 100 Canons of *Nice*, (which now all the world rings of, and all their discourses are full fraught with) *viz.* The institution of Christ, the supremacy of *Peter* devolved upon him, the universal Tradition of the whole Church. But of all these here is *altum silentium*, for you must conceive, these were arguments laid up in store (like the treasure in St. *Marks* Chest) for some high future exigencies, or wisely reserved for a season, wherein the World should wonder after the Beast, and be most capable of such impressions. Well, the Fathers consider his Petition, (for as yet the Popes were not masters of their Art, and had not learned their Lesson of *Volumus, Statuimus, Mandamus,*) & marvel at the proposition, and tell *Faustus* and his Collegues, that they find no such Canons in their Copies of the Councel of *Nice* as were alledged, and had indeed been forged at Rome (as is acknowledged

knowledged even by that Popish Councel of [a] *Florence*) Hereupon a motion is made and agreed, that they send forthwith to the Bishops of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, for their Copies of the Acts of that Councel. (A fawcy trick it was not onely to deny the Popes Infallibility, but also to question his Verity) when they receive them, they find that the pretended Canons were not there, and so conclude, there should be no appeales from *Africa* to the Roman Bishop. A strange boldness in this Councel to reverse the institution of Christ, and usurpe upon St. *Peters* Jurisdiction, and provoke him upon whom they wholly depended for the Confirmation of all their Decrees! it is great pitty they were not better advised. Well, you may imagine what sad tidings this was at *Rome*. You will desire to know what their Answer is, why then for your satisfaction, I pray you take notice: They have a Tradition at *Rome* (it is part of that inscription upon *Seth's* Pillars, erected before the flood, which *Josephus* mentions, the Counterpart whereof they have in the *Vatican*) that when ever his Holiness is gravel'd with an hard Argument, and can do no good about the premises, it may be lawful for him, or others pleading for him, to deny the Conclusion. *Bellarmine's* words are expresse: *The African Fathers were deceived through ignorance* [b]. What pitty was it that *Bellarmine* was not their Secretary to informe them better. *The African Fathers did rashly, and departed from the example and obedience of their Ancestors* saith *Stapleton* [c]. q. d. they

a *Nonne vides reverende Pater summum Pontificem Zosimum falsum decretum & non in Synodo promulgatum ad tantum Concilium pro re tam magna misisse?*

b *Africani Patres ignorantia decepti erant. de Pontif. lib. 2. cap 25. §. Respondemus.* c *Patres Africani temerè fecerunt & à majorum suorum obedientia & exemplis hac in re recesserunt. in Princip fid. con. 3. q. 7. in solut. arg. 2.*

were naughty boyes and deserved to be whipped into better manners; The more inexculable the Pope that did not thunder them into order by his Excommunications, But why do I mention these? Behold a greater than *Bellarmine* or *Stapleton* is here; Enter *Bonifacethe* second, who thus writes in his Epistle to *Eulabius* (an Epistle owned for his by *Pighius*, *Lindanus*, *Sanderus*, *Turrianus*, *Alanus Copus*, ann *Harding*, though *Bellarmine* being urged with it, pretends it is suspected, but dare not say it is forged.) *Aurelius with his Collegues* (whereof S. *Austin* was one) *by the instigation of the Devil, began proudly to exalt themselves against the Church of Rome*[a]. So it seems these Fathers were wickedly resolved against the Supremacy of the Pope, with a *Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo*, and they, whom so many of the Learned Papists affirme to be infallibly guided by the Spirit of God, his Holiness delares they were acted by the Divel. By this time I hope the Reader, that is not wholly blind, may see the vanity of this Argument from Tradition. Catholick Tradition is pretended at *Rome* for the Popes Supremacy and Infallibility: This Tradition with others comes to them by uninterrupted succession from the Apostle, wherein (by the Argument I have now in consideration) it was impossible for the Bishops or Governours of the Church, either to misunderstand the mind of their Ancestors, or wittingly to deceive their posterity. That which they make impossible to be done, the instance proposed discovers to be certainly done, it being impossible that the Fathers should make such a decree, in they had no either been ignorant of such a Tradition (as *Bellarmine* chargeth them) or wilfully and ma-

a *Aurelius cum Collegiis, instigante Diabolo, superbire contra ecclesiam Romanam cœpit.*

litiously

litiously opposed it (as the Pope accuseth them.) And forasmuch as these Fathers pleaded a Tradition directly contrary to that which the Romanists pretend, *viz.* that there should be no appeals to *Rome*, it irresistibly followes that Tradition hath deceived either them formerly, or the Papists at this day. I shall dismisse this Answer with a remarke upon the whole matter, that if the Pope and popish faction durst for their own base and ambitious designes, use such palpable forgery in a time of so much light, when they had so many diligent observers and potent opposers, I leave to the prudent Reader to imagine, what forgeries might be expected from them in after ages, in times of ignorance and carelessnesse, when all the world was in a deep sleep, and the Pope onely vigilant to improve all occasions to his advantage, and had almost all Princes and People in the Christian World at his Devotion. And thus much may serve for the seventh Answer, wherein I have been the more prolix, because it strikes at the root of the Argument, and not oneiy proves the possibility of deceit in Traditions, but also discovers the ways and modes by which mistakes may be committed, and falshoods introduced under pretence of Tradition.

I will adde but one thing more.

§. 24. *Answ.* 8. And last, if the Tradition pretended give us infallible assurance that the Doctrines of the present Church of *Rome* are come from the Apostles; then the Romish Church holdeth no Doctrines, but such as they have received from the Apostles: But the Romish Church holdeth many doctrines which she hath not received from the Apostles. This I might take for granted, having already proved it in that fundamental Tradition of the Church of *Rome* concerning the Popes Supremacy: I might refer the Reader to what I have reported out of diverse Popish Authors of greatest note,

concerning their acknowledgments of their departing from the Doctrines and practises of the Fathers: and having said so much there, I shall content my self with mentioning two particulars. The first shall be (that which hath been more largely discussed *Chap.* 3. whether I refer the Reader) about the blessed *Virgins* conception in original sin. The present Doctrine of the Romish Church (or at least of the farre greatest part and most eminent members of it) is for her immaculate Conception, as I shewed before from the Decrees of Popes and Universities, *&c.* and innumerable of their most approved Authors. How much this opinion was favoured by the Councel of *Trent*, sufficiently appears from their Decree about Original sin; (though cunningly and doubtfully delivered, as the Devils Oracles used to be) in which Decree they declare that they would not comprehend the Blessed *Virgin*: The sence of which Decree (according to that favourable glosse which Mr *White* puts upon it) was this, That the Councel did judge both opinions probable. Now from the businesse thus stated I gather two undeniable Arguments to prove the Fallibility of Tradition. 1. Tradition told the Antient Fathers that one of those opinions was positively false, *viz.* That the Blessed *Virgin* was not conceived in sin: Tradition told the Councel of *Trent* that either of these opinions was probably true, which is an implicit contradiction. 2. Seeing in this hot contest not yet ended between the different Factions of the Romanists in this point, both sides pretend Tradition for their contrary opinions (and both agree in this to hold nothing but what they have by Tradition,) Therefore Tradition must needs have deceived one of them, *Ergo* it is not Infallible. To which I shall adde, that the Doctrine which the most and learnedst of them hold, *viz.* of immaculate conception, was not received by Tradition from the Fathers, as I have shewed

ed from the ingenuous confessions of their most Learned Writers, to which I adde those words of *Melchior Canus*, *That the Blessed Virgin was wholly free from Original sin cannot be proved out of Scripture, according to its genuine meaning.* But this is but a small matter to give the Scripture a go by, let us see what he saith of the Golden rule of Tradition, therefore he adds presently, *Nor can it be said that it came into the Church by Apostolicall Tradition, for those Traditions could not come to our hands by any other than those Bishops, and holy Authors which succeeded the Apostles: But it is evident that those antient Writers did not receive it from their Ancestors, for then they would have faithfully delivered it to their posterity* (a). And yet if Mr *Whites* Discourse be solid) in spight of your eyes you shall believe, not onely that no Doctrine is delivered by the Church of *Rome* which hath not been conveyed to their hands from Fathers to Children, even from the Apostles dayes, but that it was impossible any other Doctrine should creep in.

The other instance is that of the *Canon* of the Scripture imposed upon us by the Church of *Rome*, which they say is another Apostolicall Tradition, and yet their own prime Authors, confess the most antient Fathers to be on our side, at least as to several of their Apocryphall Books: *Sixtus Senensis* gives them to us in generall: *The Antient Fathers did hold the controverted Books to be*

---

a *Beatam virginem à peccato originali fuisse penitus liberam è Libris sacris juxta germanum literæ sensum nusquam habetur —— Nec vero dici potest per Traditionem Apostolorum, id in Ecclesiam descendisse. Cum hujusmodi Traditiones non per alios quam Episcopos illos antiquos & sanctos Authores Apostolis succedentes ad nos usque pervenerint. At constat priscos illos Scriptores non id à majoribus accepisse. Traderent enim bonâ fide & ipsi posteris suis, loc. com. l. 7. cap. 3. conclus. 4.*

un-canonicall

un-canonicall (a). *Bellarmine* gives us *Epiphanius, Hilary, Ruffinus*, and *Hierom*; (b) *Canus* gives us *Origen, Damascen, Athanasius*, and *Melito* (c) a famous and antient Father, who flourished *Anno* 170. and was a man of great judgment and venerable Sanctity, saith *Sixtus Senensis*, who purposely travelled to the Eastern Churches (where the Apostles had their principal residence and employment) to learne out the true Canon, and bring a *non est inventus* for the Apocryphal Books, and returnes, with the very same Canon which we own, so that in him we have the Testimonies of all those flourishing and Apostolical Churches, to which *Tertullian* directs us for the discovery of the Truth. Nor to this day have the Papists cited one Father or Councel, within the compass of 600 (I think I may say a 1000) years, who did receive their whole Canon, and consequently none of them (for ought appears in their Writings) knew any thing of this pretended Tradition, but (as it seems by the story) when the Image of *Diana* dropt down from Heaven, she brought this Tradition along with her. The like might be shewed in sundry other particulars: In the celebacy of Priests, which is only *de jure humano*, not *divino*, by the confession of *Thomas, Dnrandus, Lombardus*, and *Scotus*, four principal pillars of the Papall Church, and *Turrianus* was noted by *Cassander* as the onely man of all, both old and late writers of the Popish party, who maintained the *jus divinum* of it: But if it were an Apostolicall Tradition, it was *de jure Divino*, and the Councel of Nice would never have dispensed with a Divine Injunction. So in the worshipping of Images, Transubstantion,

a *Prisci patres Libros controversos pro Non Canonicis habuerunt* Bibloth *sanct. lib.* 1. *Sect.* 1.

b *De verbo Dei lib.* 1, *c.* 20. c *Loc. Theol. lib.* 2, *c.* 10.

Purgatory,

Purgatory, and many other considerable points wherein I need say nothing, because it hath been so fully cleared by diverse Learned Protestant Writers, particularly, by *Jewel, Usher* in his Answer to the Jesuites Challenge; *Moulins* Novelty of Popery, *Dallaus* in several pieces, *Rainolds* de Libris Apocryphis, *Whitaker, Chamier*, and innumerable others: But *manum de Tabulâ*.

This I hope may suffice for the refutation of this novel invention, concerning the Infallibility of Tradition, and the Testimony of the present Church, where I have been more large, because it is a late plea, and lesse hath been said of it by Protestant Authors. And so it remaines unshaken, That a Papists Faith hath no solid Foundation in orall Tradition, and the present Churches Authority, which was the businesse of this Proposition.

CHAP. VI.

Of Miracles, and the motives of credibility.

Sect. 1. BUt we are not yet come to the end of our journey, And although the Arguments urged by Protestants against their resolution of Faith, have probably convinced the consciences of diverse of them, yet have they not stop'd their mouths. We have shewed in the former Chapters, how they have been driven from post to post, and as in a besieged Citty, when the Walls and Works of it are battered down, they raise new fortifications, so having seen their former pretences batter'd about their eares, some of them have devised one shift more; for finding themselves yet in that ridiculous Circle (of believing the Scripture for the Churches sake, and the Church for Scriptures sake) notwithstanding

withſtanding all the attempts of their Brethren to get out; Some of them have taken up their reſt in the markes of a Church, and the motives of credibility.

This (though rejected by former and learneder Papiſts yet) of late hath been taken up by *Turnebull* in his *Tetragoniſmus*, a Diſcourſe about the Object of Faith, and after him by the late Anſwerer of Biſhop *Lauds* Book, called *Lawd's Labyrinth*, whoſe words are theſe: *We prove the Churches Infallibility not by Scripture but by the motives of Credibility, and ſignes of the Church, which are theſe, ſanctity of life, miracles, efficacy, purity, and excellency of Doctrine, fulfilling of Prophecies, ſucceſſion of lawfully ſent Paſtours, Vnity, Antiquity, and the very name of Catholick. Then* (ſaith he) *having thus proved the Churches Infallible Authority, and by that received the Scripture, we confirme the ſame by Scripture, which Scripture proofs are not Prime and Abſolute, but onely ſecondary and* ex ſuppoſitione, & ad hominem, *or* ex principiis conceſſis *againſt Sectaries* (a). This is their plea, concerning which I ſhall need to ſay the leſſe, becauſe the Book wherein it is revived and urged, called *Labyrinthus Cantuarienſis*, is ſo ſolidly and Learnedly Anſwered by my worthy friend Mr. *Stillingfleet*: Yet having finiſhed this Diſcourſe long before that excellent work came forth, and having twiſted it into the method of the preſent Treatiſe and deſigne, I thought not fit wholly to ſuperſede it, whereby the body of the work would be renderd lame, and incompleat, but rather to be ſhorter in it, and as far as I can, to cut off ſuch paſſages as happily may be coincident with what is ſaid by Mr. *Stillingfleet* in that particular; for I do not deſire *actum agere*.

---

a *Chap.* 5.

§. 2.

§. 2. *Answ.* 1. Let it be observed, how shamelessely these men abuse their Readers, when they pretend the Infallibility of the Church is solidly demonstrated from Scripture; (and this they generally do:) Here you have *rem confitentem*, they confesse the imbecillity of those Arguments; For (say they) they are but secondary proofs, and *Argumenta ad hominem*: Now such Arguments are not cogent and concluding in themselves, but onely do conclude against some particular Adversary from his own principles: So they acknowledge that although their Arguments may perswade one that is docible, yet they cannot convince a gainsayer: And the strength of their Argument depends upon the Courtesy of the Protestants.

§. 3. 2. In vaine are these Marks of a Church pleaded for the infallibility of the Church of Rome, when other Churches have a juster claime to them, and so little colour have the Romanists for their monopoly of them; that upon enquiry it will be found they have no considerable interest in them: This I shall shew in the principall and most important of them. 1. The first in dignity (though not in order) is the glory of Miracles: The most eminent in this kind are confessed to be those which were done by Christ and his Apostles. Those Miracles were done in Confirmation of the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, not of the Church of Rome, which appears thus: These Miracles were done in confirmation of the Doctrine delivered in the Scriptures, but the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches is the Doctrine deliverd in the Scriptures, and the Doctrine of the present Church of Rome is repugnant thereunto: *Ergo*, These Miracles were done in confirmation of the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches. The *Major* our adversaries dare not deny: The *Minor* hath been undeniably evidenced so much to the Conviction of our Adversaries,

versaries, that they dare not own the Scripture for their Judge, and instead of submitting themselves to its sentence, bend their wits to except against the judge, and decline its Tribunal, following that Counsel which was given to *Pericles*, when he was studying how to give up his accounts to the *Athenians*, that he should rather study how to give up no account at all. And some of them (whose words are recited in this Treatise) acknowledge the folly of their brethren, who would manage their cause by Scripture Arguments. But whether the Protestant Doctrine hath been solidly evinced from Scripture or not, thus much undoubtedly followes, that if any miracles be pretended against that Doctrine which Christ sealed by his miracles, they are not to be regarded, and the miracles done by Christ *&c.* are infinitely to be preferred before them; and consequently the glory of Miracles is more ours then theirs.

§. 4. The like I may say secondly, for the efficacy of Doctrine, which they so confidently appropriate to themselves: But if the Efficacy of their sword were not greater then that of their Doctrine, the world would quickly see the vanity of that Argument: And how little confidence themselves put in it may be seen by the professed necessity of an Inquisition. Next news I expect is to hear this Argument pleaded on the behalf of the Alcoran, I am sure it may upon as good grounds, their religion being much of the same complexion, and the Popish cause being managed most commonly by *Mahumetan* weapons. But on the contrary let a man consider with himself, the miraculous successe of the Protestant Religion in the late Reformation, how strangely, speedily, generally, it diffused it self, in the very same manner as the Gospel did in its first Plantation in the World, notwithstanding the great disadvantages it was to grapple with; the horrible ignorance & perverseness of the Age,

the

the mighty power of long custome and inveterate prejudice, the craft of Politicians, the learning of the whole World, the might of Princes and Emperours, the threats, fires, inquisitions of Persecutors, the great offers, and multiplied allurements to Apostacy; I say, he that shall review all these things (as they are recorded by the Historians of both parties) will understand to whom this Character belongs.

§. 5. For the purity and excellency of their Doctrine: If their and our Doctrines were to be tried by that test, the controversie would speedily be at an end. The Word of God is the palace and rule of purity, and that Doctrine which hath most of conformity therewith, hath most of purity. Howsoever, it is too grosse a begging of the question, to alledge that for a note and evidence of their Church, which is more doubtfull than the Church it self: And for the Sanctity of their lives, we are heartily glad to hear of it; if the reports were as credible as the news is good, it would rejoyce our hearts, because their own Authors in several Ages, have successively acknowledged and bewailed, the horrible and universal wickedness of their own Church, Clergy, Popes *&c.* All stories are full of their monstrous filthinesse, though otdinarily masked under the pretence of external holinesse. And for the Holinesse of their Church of late times, I shall onely say this: Of all men they have least cause to dispute against *faith alone*, for he that can believe their sanctity had need be a Solifidian, and have neither sense nor reason: but you must know the Church of Rome lives upon her old stock, it is the holiness of their Ancestors which they intend. *Bellarmine* is forced to go far back for his proofs, for he alleadgeth the Sanctity of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Antient Fathers as arguments of their Holinesse; so the Church of Rome is all on a sudden grown Orthodox in the doctrine of imputation

imputation, with this proviso, that they allow the imputation of the righteousnesse of their Ancestors to the present Church, but not of their wickednesse, you may as farre as you please even to *Adam*, nay, if you will, even to the Father of the *Preadamitæ*, impute to them the Holiness of their Ancestors, but for the prodigious filthinesse, the Sorceries, Adulteries, Murders, Heresies of their Fathers, and former Bishops, and Popes, that ought not to be imputed to them.

§. 6. And for the other grand Character of consent with Antiquity, which they vaunt so much of, among those, that either have not learning to search into the Antients, or wit to judg of what they read, to say nothing of this, that the hoary head of Antiquity is not to be respected, if it be not found in the way of righteousnes; evill doctrines or habits, the more Antient, the worse, and the inveterateness of a disease, is no commendation to it. He that shall please to look into the Fathers with his own eyes, or peruse the Discourses of our learned Authors upon this point, such as *Rainolds, Jewel, Whitaker, Chamier, Dallæus, Albertinus, Usher, Morton, Morney, Rivet*, and multitudes more, will soon discover the impudence of this plea; and the fruit of their labours would quickly appear in the World, but for that piece of their imposture, that as they deny the reading of the Scripture to lay-men, so they forbid the reading of our Protestant Authors to their Scholars; excepting such whose consciences they find to be of a Jesuiticall complexion, and free from the heresy of tenderness.

§. 7. I know it will be said, that we want diverse of those marks which they have, as Duration, Amplitude, Visible succession, union among our selves and with the Pope: But although the Papists have no colourable pretence to those Characters, among such as will inquire into the verity of their Assertions, and not greedily swallow

swallow down all of them; though in point of duration divers of the most material Doctrines of the present Romish Church are so far from it, that they stand convicted of Novelisme by the confession of their own Authors. And for Amplitude, notwithstanding all their intolerable boasting with the credulous vulgar, the learned know, the Church of *Rome* containeth not one third part of the Christian World. And for Succession, their own Authors have acknowledged frequent and long interruptions, yea even in the Papal See. Yet if all that might be said upon those points were superseded, if they grant us, or we can prove the former, *viz.* that the miracles confirme our Doctrine, the Fathers professe our Faith, that the efficacy, purity, and excellency of Doctrine belong to us, we do not much matter the rest, nor will the Reader, who is satisfied in the former, be at all startled at the latter.

§. 8 3. Consider what rotten pillars most of these are, upon which the Church of *Rome* leanes, and you will find they need no *Sampson* to pull them down; one of them excepted, which *Bellarmine* therefore puts in the first place, and that is from the name of *Catholick*, as being grounded upon that infallible Maxime, *Conveniunt rebus nomina sæpe suis*: That therefore cannot be resisted, onely I blame *Bellarmines* oversight, that being so hard put to it to prove the Sanctity of his Church, he did not prove it from the Title of *Holiness* given to the head of it: and then here had been a pair of Demonstrations not to be parallel'd in all *Euclid*.

§. 9. And for several other marks, there is this inexcusable error in them, that they alledge those notes to prove the Church, which are altogether impertinent and ridiculous, if you do not presuppose the Church: so they wisely suppose, what they see they cannot prove: I instance in Duration, Antiquity, Unity, Amplitude,

Succession, against which I thus argue: Either these do prove the being of the Church where ever they are, and the want of a Church where they are absent, or they do not; if they do not, then they are absurdly brought to prove their Church: if you say they do, then where those Characters are found, there is a true Church, and where they are wanting, there is no Church. But neither one, nor the other is true; not the first, for there is not one of those now mentioned but have agreed to Pagans or Hereticks. Who knows not the Antiquity, Duration, Amplitude, and Unity of the Pagan Religion? All those were the Arguments of the Heathens against the Christians, & the Papists have these arrowes out of their Quiver: and to say truth, it is but reasonable, that they that have borrowed so much of their Religion and Worship from the Pagans, should also borrow their Arguments: for you know the accessary followes the Principal, the onely wonder is, how those Arguments which were weak and absurd in the Pagans (and so judged and rejected by the Antient Fathers) are become strong in the Papists? But I know a reason for that too. The Pope pretends to a Divinity upon Earth, and consequently he can make weak things strong, and as the Authority of the Romish Church is Infallible, so their Arguments are without all doubt irresistible. Who knows not that the *Arrian* Heresy overspread the World? That the mystery of iniquity which began to work in S. *Pauls* dayes, was not to be finished and destroyed until Christs second comming? 2 *Thes.* 2. That there was a time when the whole world wonder'd after the Beast.

And for the latter branch, who knows not that the Christian Church was a true Church, when it wanted those Characters, or at least diverse of them, when it was in its Infancy, and therefore could not have Duration, when confined to a narrow room, *Act.* 1. and therefore had

had no Amplitude? and consequently, these are no necessary marks, nor certain discoveries of the true Church as the Popish Doctors make their simple Proselytes believe. So succession of Pastours signifies nothing, unlesse you presuppose the truth of the Church, whereof they are Pastors, which forceth their own Author to confesse, *that without true doctrine, there is no true succession*, and that *a local succession alone without a profession of sound doctrine is no certain note*: so *Stapleton* [a]. And *Bellarmine* ingeniously acknowledgeth, *that this argument of Succession is brought by them chiefly to prove, that there is no Church, where there is no succession, from whence it doth not follow* (saith he) *necessarily, that the Church is there, where succession is* [b]. So if this argument should possibly disprove our Church, yet it doth not prove theirs.

§. 10. So for Unity, it is a Shoe will fit every foot, and hath been urged by Pagans, (whose great argument against Christianity, was taken from the divisions of Christians, and the unity of Pagans in their Religion,) and the Fathers answered the Pagans, (as we do the Papists) that as the Church of God is one; so the Devil's *Babylon* is one, as St. *Austin* expresseth it, and that Unity without Verity is not to be regarded. It was no argument of the verity and infallibility of the Jewish Church, that they were united against Christ, nor was it an evidence that the Church of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, and others mentioned in the New Testament were not the true Churches of

---

a *Etsi absque vera doctrina non sit vera successio.* —Et post: *Sola loci occupatio non est certa nota: sic carnales Judæi de suo templo supponebant, sed sanæ quoque doctrinæ pariter cum loco professio. Relect. con. 1. qu. 4. art. 2.*

b *Hoc argumentum probat non esse Ecclesiam, ubi non est successio: ex quo tamen colligitur necessariò ibi esse ecclesiam, ubi non est successio, lib. 4. de notis Ecclesiæ c. 8. Sect. Dico secundo.*

Christ, because they were pester'd with fearful divisions, and worse opinions, than those which are owned by any Divines of the Protestant confession. But if this test were allowed, if things be weighed, they would have little benefit by it. I know there is nothing more familiar with the Romanists, than to possess silly seduced creatures with an opinion of their unity, and our divisions: I wish the latter were not more evident than the former; God open the eyes, and humble and forgive those, who by causing divisions and offences among us, have laid this stumbling block in their way! it is no wonder, they that cannot examine things, are deceived with words. But if any discreet person look within the veile, and compare their condition and ours, he will find *Cledius accusat machos*; and that they do, as if a man infected with a leprosy should reproach one who was troubled with the itch; for as if a man, whose hand was cut off, should quarrel with another for having a scratch on his finger. As for our Churches, I know it is usual for the Papists to charge us with the frantick opinions of Quakers, the desperate heresies of *Socinus*, and the like; but they would take it ill, if we should charge their Religion with all the Blasphemous, atheistical, heretical opinions of some that have lived amongst them. Their own consciences tell them, that these, though they are among us, yet they are not of us. He that would judge righteous judgment, must take his æstimate from the publick confessions of the protestant Churches, (whose Harmony is published and proved to all the world,) and such of our learned Doctors as adhere to it, and there he shall find the diversities of opinion amongst us are onely in some lesser points, happily about Government, or other circumstantial things; but it is most certain, and undeniable, that all of them do hold the head, & agree in all the fundamental points of Religion. But on the other side, what if there be cloven tongues

in

in Protestant Churches? Is *Rome* a City at unity within it self? How come we then to hear the noise of axes and hammers among the builders of their Temple? 300 differences have been collected out of *Bellarmines* words and works, and several of them of greater importance than any of our divisions [a]. It is true they have a pretty knack, when we tell them of their divisions; they say they are not in things *de fide*: I see, *Duo cùm faciunt idem non sunt idem*. It is a woful division among us between Remonstrants and Contra-remonstrants: but the same difference among them between Jesuites and Dominicans, that is of no moment. Oh ye foolish Papists! how long will you love simplicity? So for that great division among them, about the very foundation of their Faith, (which is ten times more weighty than all the Protestant Differences put together,) the Popes infallibility; they tell you, it is not *de fide*, although indeed it be their *fundamentum fundamentorum*, and their whole Religion hangs upon it, at least in the judgment of all the Jesuites, and the far greatest number of the learned Doctors and eminent writers of the Church of *Rome* of this age. It is confessed by themselves, that they are divided in this great point: so *Bellarmine* tels you, *The second opinion is, that the Pope as Pope may teach heresy*; this opinion (saith he) *is defended by* Nilus *some Parisians, as* Gerson, *and* Almaine, *and* Alphonsus de Castro, *and* Adrian *the sixth a Pope, in his question of Confirmation.* So we have the infallibility of the Pope to assure us, that the Pope hath not infallibility. *And this opinion* (saith he) *is not properly heretical, for we see the Church doth still tolerate it, yet it is erroneous, and*

a See Pappus *his* Contradictiones Doctorum Romæ Ecclesiæ, *and* Bishop Halls Peace of Rome.

very near heresie [a]. I will tell you how near it is, when the Jesuites have throughly leaven'd the world with that opinion; and perfectly destroyed the liberties of the Gallican Churches, and the Pope can do it without raising a commotion in his own Kingdome, then you shall find this *Embryo* perfected, and it is become a compleat Heresie. In like manner saith Dr. *Holden*, speaking of the Pope's infallibility: *We see it argued on both sides by many most godlie and learned Catholicks, both antient and modern, and neither part hath yet been censured, or prohibited, and therefore it is evident, no Catholick is bound to this or that side.* By which one instance you may see, how much reason we have to bespeak them, as Christ did the Pharisees, Matth. 7.5. *Thou Hypocrite, first cast out the Beam out of thine own eye, and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the Mote out of thy Brothers eye.* Thus we see when their pretended signs come to be examined, they are lighter than vanity, as we have seen by this short and transient consideration of the most and weightiest of them.

§. 11. But, although other evidences are pleaded, yet the rest of them come in onely as handmaids to the principal Character of miracles, for here it is that they set up their rest, and so must I too for a season. So the answerer of Bishop *Laud*: *The Church is proved to be infallible the same way that Moses, Christ, and his Apostles were proved to be infallible, and that was by the sanctity of their life,*

---

a *Secunda sententia est, Pontificem etiam ut Pontificem, posse esse hæreticum, & docere hæresin: — hanc opinionem sequitur & juetur Nilus, — & aliquot Parisienses, & Gerson, & Almain, nec non* Alphonsus de Castro, — & Adrianus 6. *Papa in quæstione de Confirmatione.* Et post: *Hæc sententia non est propriè hæretica, nam adhuc videmus ab Ecclesia tolerari, qui illam sententiam sequuntur, tamen videtur omnino erronea, & hæresi proxima. De Pontif. lib. 4. c. 2.*

and

and the glory of their miracles. The works of Christ did of themselves without Scripture prove Christ to be infallible. John 5.36. and 10.25,38. and 14. 11. *and the Apostles confirmed their words by signes, Mark.*14.19. [a] And consequently, the miracles done by the Church of *Rome* do without Scripture prove her infallibility. This is their last plea, they are now brought to their last legs; if this fail them, they are lost.

§. 12. *Ans.* 1. If the Miracles of Christ, and his Apostles did prove their infallibility in the doctrine they delivered, then they prove the fallibility of the Church of *Rome*, and their actual error, because they are visibly departed from that Doctrine, and if they prove any infallibility, they prove theirs who adhere to the Doctrine of the Scriptures. And so we thank them for this argument.

§. 13. *Ans.* 2. Although where miracles are true, and many, and evident, and uncontrolled, they give a great stroke to the proof of that doctrine, which is confirmed by them, yet it is false to say, that Christ, or his Apostles did require an absolute submission to, and beliefe of every doctrine, upon the bare account of miracles, without any reference to Scripture. And it is most certain, that Christ and his Apostles (notwithstanding their miracles) did prove their doctrines from, & allow their hearers to examine their doctrines by the Scripture. This strikes at the Foundation of their argument and plea, and therefore I shall endeavour thoroughly to prove it.

§. 14. 1. This appears from the expresse commands of Christ, and the Apostles to that purpose. In the same place, where Christ bids them believe him for his works sake, he commands them to believe him for the Scriptures sake, Joh. § 39. *Search the Scriptures.* And if the former

---

a *Chap.* 5. *of Lauds Labyrinth.*

prove the sufficiency of their argument from miracles; why should not the latter prove the sufficiency of the Protestants argument from Scripture? especially if you consider, that Christ apparently prefers Scripture arguments before that of miracles: for in that 5th of *John*, where he ascends gradually from the weakest to the strongest testimonies, he placeth them in this order: First he urgeth *John*'s testimony, *vers.* 32. next, the testimony of his miracles, *vers.* 36. and last, the testimony of Scriptures, *v.* 39. And this more fully appears from *Luk.* 16. 29. *If they hear not Moses, and the Prophets, neither will they be perswaded, though one rose from the dead.* Upon which words *Chrysostome*'s glosse is full and cogent, (at least to them who pretend to rely upon the Fathers authority, and exactly to maintain their Doctrines:) his words are these; *That you may see, that the Doctrine of the Prophets,* (and consequently of the Apostles,) *is more to be believed than the preaching of one raised from the dead; consider this, that every one that is dead, is a servant, but what the Scripture speaks, those things the Lord speaks* (a). Whence I thus argue: The Authority of the Lord is not onely greater *in se*, but more credible *quoad nos*, than the authority of the Servant: This no man living will deny. But the Authority of Scripture is the authority of the Lord, and the Authority of the Pope, (adde a Councel to him, if you please) is the authority of a Servant, yea (if you take that in earnest, which is intended onely for a complement) *a Servant of Servants*: Ergo the Scripture is more to be credited than the Pope or Church. It was a

(a) Ἵνα δὲ καὶ ἐτερώθεν μάθῃς ὅτι ἀξιοπιστότερα ἡ τῶν προφητῶν διδασκαλία τῆς τῶν ἀναστάμενων ἀπαγγελίας, ἐκεῖνο σκόπησον ὅτι νεκρὸς μὲν ἅπας δοῦλός ἐστιν, ἃ δ' αἱ γραφαὶ φθέγγονται ταῦτα ὁ δεσπότης ἐφθέγξατο &c. 5. *operum de Lazaro; concione* 4.

good

good turn for the Pope, that *Greg. de Valentia* hath assured him, that if the Fathers do at any time talke sawcily, *Sua tum constat authoritas Romano Pontifici* i.e. The Pope will keep his authority and infallibility in spight of them, else I am afraid this passage of S. *Chrysostomes* might have done his Holiness a discourtesy. And this farther appears from 2 *Pet.* 1. where you have the question expressly decided; for after the Apostles had confirmed his doctrine from that miraculous appearance of God in the Mount, and that voice from Heaven, he addes, *vers.* 19. *We have a more sure word of Prophecy.* The *Bereans* did not believe S. *Paul's* infallibility, barely upon the account of his miracles, (nor are they therefore blamed) but did examine his doctrines by the Scriptures, (and for that they are commended) *Act.* 17. 11.

§. 15. 2. It was not the will of Christ, that all miracles should be believed, but he would have some miracles rejected, therefore he would not have all miracles in themselves, and for themselves, credited an owned. The Assumption I prove by three arguments.

§. 16. 1. Christs will was compliant with his Fathers will, and he came to fulfill Gods word, not to destroy it: But this was the expresse will of God, that all miracles should not be credited. This no man can doubt of, that reads Deut. 13. *If there arise among you a Prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign, or a wonder, and the sign or wonder come to passe, whereof he spak unto thee, saying, Let us go after other Gods, —and let us serve them, thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that Prophet, for the Lord your God proveth you.* Whence it irrefragably followes, that if it could without blasphemy be imagined, that Jesus Christ had delivered such a doctrine as this, *Let us goe after other Gods*, his miracles should have been disowned, and rejected, and therefore miracles of themselves are not to be credited.

§. 17.

§. 17. 2. Christ and his Apostles have foretold us, that miracles should be done by the teachers of false doctrines, Therefore miracles in themselves are no sufficient evidence of the truth of a Doctrine. The Consequence none can deny. The Antecedent (which alone can admit of doubt is so evident from plain Scriptures, that I need onely recite them. I will mention onely two places: 2 Thes. 2. 9. *The coming of Antichrist is said to be after the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders*: and that you may see they are called lying wonders, not so much *ratione materiæ*, (because they are fabulous, and pretended,) as *ratione finis*, (because brought to confirme a lye,) it is said Apoc. 13. 13, 14. That *he doth great wonders, so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by means of those miracles, which he had power to do.* I tell you, the world is well mended with the Church of *Rome*, that those miracles which in the Apostles dayes were foretold as a character of Antichristianity, are now become an evidence of Infallibility.

§. 18. 3. That evidence which Christ speaks of, as common to himself and counterfeit-Messiahs, is no sufficient evidence, nor at all to be equall'd with that evidence which is peculiar to the true Messias: But the evidence of miracles Christ speaks of, as common to himself and counterfeit Messiahs. This is plain from Matth. 24. 24. *There shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets, and shall shew great signes and wonders, that if it were possible, they should deceive the very elect.* The Scripture only is the sure Κεστήριον: and therefore what Divines observe of the Spirits testimony, that it is alwaies conjunct with the testimony of conscience (and therefore it is not said, μαρτυρεῖ, but συμμαρτυρεῖ) the like we may discern in this, That where Christ urgeth the argument of Miracles, he doth it in conjunction with the Scripture, as we saw in *Joh.* 5. and the

the like we have *Joh.*10. 25--38. where Christ pleads his works onely as they are done *in his fathers name*, that is not onely as he pretended his Fathers name, (for so did the false Christs *Mat.*24.) but he really acted them with his commission, and in conformity to his will and word: So that the Scripture is the only σημεῖον, and not miracles in themselves, as this argument of the Papists falsly supposeth.

§.19. *Answ.*3. If it were admitted, that mirales (and the like may be said of all the rest of their marks of a Church) do prove the verity of a doctrine, yet they do not necessarily prove the Infallibility of him that doth those works, or receives that doctrine. Observe this, for it strikes at the root of this their last pretence. The notes of a man may prove his manhood, but they do not prove his nobility, wisdome, learning: these must be proved *aliunde* from another head. The Protestant notes of a Church do prove the being and truth of our Church, but not its infallibility, nor would they do it, if the Protestants pretended or desired it, (for mens pretences, or desires do not alter the nature of things,) I say, the notes do prove the Churches verity. But what are the priviledges of that Church so constituted in being, and whether Infallibility be one of them, that is another question, and the resolution of it must be fetched from another Topick: now that this is so, I shall plainly and briefly, and (if I mistake not) undeniably prove. It is granted, that the gift of miracles was not peculiar to the Apostles, but was communicated by God to other Ministers and Christians in the primitive times: either then they must say, that every such Minister and Christian, singly considered, was infallible, (which no man ever yet was so impudent to affirm.) or confess, that miracles are no sufficient evidence of Infallibility. It was enough that miracles did confirme the doctrines delivered, whether by Apostles,

Apostles, or other Ministers, for the confirmation of our Faith (though they had been otherwise fallible.) But if they will do that which never man did, *viz.* assert the infallibility of every such worker of miracles, then not only the Pope and Councels and Catholick Church are infallible, but also *Xaverius* the Jesuite, (of whose miracles they tell us so many fine stories, though he himself in his Epistles speaks not a syllable of them, and bewails the want of the gift of Tongues, a miracle (if any) most necessary for the conversion of the *Indians*, I say, (if their own relations of these miracles may be credited) he must be infallible. And so here is another article of the Popish Creed: for besides the infallibility of the Church, Pope, or Councel, here is the Infallibility of the Jesuites: *Non equidem invideo, miror magis.* Yet farther, if miracles were solid proofs of Infallibility, yet they prove it onely in such persons as do them; *Papa nec feritur, nec metitur.* Why should the miracles of *Gregory* of *Nazianzen* prove the infallibility of the Bishop of *Rome*? or how come the miracles of the thundring Legion to prove the infallibility of the thundring Church of *Rome*? or by what Magical art do those miracles which left poor *Bernard* (that did them) fallible, passe over to *Rome*, and render his Holiness Infallible? The Jewish Church was not therefore infallible, because the Prophets, who wrought miracles amongst them, were thereby proved infallible: (nor do the Papists assert the infallibility of that Church, by vertue of such a priviledge belonging to those Prophets, but onely because of that promise to the High Priest, *Deut.* 17.) In like manner, if their narrations concerning the miracles of St. *Francis*, St. *Dominick* &c. were true, and if it were farther granted, that such miracles did prove their infallibility, yet this would no way prove the infallibility of the Romish Church in which they were done, so in diverse respects you see the argument falls to the ground.

§. 20.

§. 20. *Anſ.* 4. Miracles are ſo far from proving the infallibility of the perſons that do them, that they do not ſo much as prove the verity of doctrines delivered by them. That miracles have been done, (or at leaſt ſuch things, as the ſtricteſt obſervation of common prudence could not diſtinguiſh from miracles) by hereticks, yea by Pagans, is confeſſed by the Papiſts themſelves, and evinced by the known examples of *Veſpaſian*, (who cured a blind man, as *Baronius* himſelf acknowledgeth, and all Hiſtorians relate,) and *Apollonius Tyaneus*, and others. You may ſee how this troubles Card. *Bellarmin*, that he is forced to this anſwer, *That the Devil had poſſeſſed the eye of that man, that he might ſeem to cure, when he ceaſed to hurt: Mutato nomine de te Fabula narratur*: For ſo, whatſoever miracles are done, or pretended by the Papiſt for confirmation of the doctrines of Devils, (and ſuch are all repugnant to Scripture, and two of their doctrines are particularly ſo called, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3.) may as well be ſaid to be done by the colluſion of the Devil. And yet (by the way) this is no blemiſh to Gods providence to permit ſuch miracles, but an act of his wiſe counſel, and righteous judgment, that thoſe who will not be won by the Word, and thoſe glorious, abundant, and evident miracles done in the confirmation of it, may be hardned by other miracles, which (though far ſhort in number, and commonly leſſe notorious for obſervation, and leſſe beneficial for uſe) God permits to be done, and juſtly may, having forewarn'd the world of ſuch impoſtures, and foreſtall'd the minds of men with ſuch clear irradiations of his truth, and ſuch illuſtrious glory of miracles, that in compariſon of them, the following wonders were no more than the glimmering light of a Glo-worm to the ſplendor of the Sun in his Meridian: Of which we have eminent inſtances in the wonders of *Jannes* and *Jambres*, after *Pharaoh* had hardned his heart againſt the word of God,

God, and his glorious works, and afterward in the wonders of *Apollonius Tyanæus*, when men had wickedly rejected the offers of grace by Jesus Christ, and resisted the glorious light of his most excellent doctrine, and inimitable works. To make this more clear, I shall shew it under the hands of the greatest Champion of the Romish Church. *Estius* writes thus: *The Father and Historians do every where witnesse*; (so that here you have a multitude of testimonies in one) *that true miracles may be done without the Church by false Prophets, Heretick, and Schismaticks* a: and he quotes among other witnesses *Hilary*, and *Austin*, and *Gregory* the great (a Pope and therefore infallible in this assertion,) and a little after he doth so positively assert our doctrine, and so strongly batter down the pillar of the Papacy, that if you did not know the Author, you would judg him to be an absolute Protestant in that point. for after he had said, that *wonderfull works may be done by heretick, and Devils, in confirmation of false doctrine*, he addes, *but against this deceit Christ hath forewarned his faithfull ones, saying, Do not go forth, do not believe. It is to be noted, that he doth not say Examine diligently whether they be true miracles; for the principal confirmation of the faithfull ought to be the doctrine of the Church of old, confirmed by Christ and his Apostles by undoubted miracles* (b). And *Maldonate* (though as sel-

a *Passim fatentur Patres, & testantur historiæ, fieri vera miracula extra Ecclesiam etiam à Pseudoprophetis, hæreticis, & schismaticis* in sentent. lib. 2. distinct. 7. §. 18.

b *Fieri possunt ab hæreticis & Dæmonibus etiam in confirmationem falsæ doctrinæ mirabilia:* —— *sed contra hujusmodi deceptionem fideles suos præmunivit Christus, dicens, Nolite exire, nolite credere. Notandum enim quòd non dicit, Disquirite diligenter signa, num vera sint miracula. Nam præcipua confirmatio fidelium esse debet doctrina Ecclesiæ, jam olim à Christo & Apostolis per indubitata miracula confirmata,* Estius ubi sup. a Sect. 19.

dome

dome guilty of ingenuity, as most I have read) is forced to confess, that *Hierom*, *Chrysost*. *Euthymius*, *and Theophylact. do prove by many examples, that true miracles may be done by unbelievers, and* (saith he) *Christ admonisheth us, that we do not believe false Prophets, even when they work true miracles*: So little reason had the Author of *Land's Labyrinth* to call it *a strange Paradox, that true miracles may be marks of a false doctrine, and to say, that all Divines confess, that true miracles are not feasible but by an extraordinary power of God, and that God thereby seals to the truth of a doctrine, chap. 9. sect. 5.* and then to run away, as if he had throughly done his work, when you see his bold assertion confuted by more learned persons of his own party. Then again the said *Maldonate* puts a question, *Whither no argument can be drawn from miracles, to prove the truth of a doctrine?* and answers, *It follows not, that no argument can be drawn from them, but no certain argument* (a); that is, the argument from miracles is next door to none; it is probable, but not undeniable, it is conjectural, but not certain. And yet these new Doctors dare lay the foundation of all, *viz.* the Churches infallibility, upon meer conjectures, and probabilities. One would think the Jesuite had borrowed this, as he hath done hundreds of his best passages out of *Calvin*, and unadvisedly transcribed it into his commentary. And *Andradius*, the great defender of the Tridentine faith, is leaven'd with the same heresy: for he saith, St *Augustine* contendeth, *that sure and certain tokens of the Church are to be*

(a) *Hierom. Chrys. Euthym. & Theoph. multis exemplis docent etiam per homines infideles vera fieri miracula. —Et monet nos Christus, ne falsis Prophetis credamus, vera etiam miracula facientibus. —Qu. An. ergo nullum ad probandam veram doctrinam argumentum ex miraculis sumi possit? Resp. Non sequitur non omnino nullum, sed non necessarium sumi posse. in Mat. 7. 22.*

fetched

fetched out of the sacred Scriptures, because they are free from all suspition of falsehood: but miracles may be done by the help of the Devil (a). And *Gregory de Valentia* tels us plainly, *that miracles of themselves do not beget infallible certainty of the truth of a doctrine and Church, but on the contrary, the true and lawful Church gives us assurance of the truth of miracles*, as S. Austin *shews* (b). To conclude this answer, I shall onely adde *Bellarmine's* words: *Before the approbation of the Church, it is not evident, nor certain, by a certainty of faith, concerning any miracle, that it is a true miracle* (c). And therefore the Churches infallibility cannot be proved by miracles, because it must be presupposed, before these miracles can give us any certainty.

§. 21. *Ans.* 5. If all the former difficulties were removed, it profits them not; for when a man comes to look into the pieces of their argument from miracles, he shall find such horrible mistakes, and wofull impostures, that indeed it makes their cause the worse, and gives prudent men occasion to discerne, that these are the Badges of the Antichristian faction, that they are the very signes, and lying wonders foretold 2 *Thes.* 2. I shall briefly look upon some of the parts of the argument.

1. They alledge for themselves the miracles of Christ, and his Apostles, and the first Fathers, which being done

---

(a) *Augustinus contendit Ecclesiæ certa atque firma indicia è sacris literis petenda esse, quia ab omni falsitatis suspitione sunt libera. Nam cùm miracula — Dæmonum operâ fieri posse dicat* — Def. fid. lib. 2. pa. 239.

(b) *Ipsa per se miracula non efficiunt certitudinem infallibilem de veritate doctrinæ, & de Ecclesia legitima, sed contra potius Ecclesia vera & legitima certos nos de veritate miraculorum facit, ut Aug. indicat tom. 3. disp. 1. qu. 1. punct. 4. §. 3.*

(c) *Ante approbationem Ecclesiæ non est evidens aut certum certitudine fidei de ullo miraculo, quod sit verum miraculum. lib. de notis Eccles. a. 14.*

in

in confirmation of a doctrine (as repugnant to theirs as Heaven is to Hell) are so far from proving their infallibility, that they demonstrate their Falshood and Heresy.

2. They plead all those miracles, as testimonies to the present doctrine of the Romish Church, which were done by such as though they lived in the communion of the Church of *Rome*, yet did complain of their corruptions, and condemn diverse of their present doctrines: as appears in *Bernard*, particularly in the great doctrine of Merit.

3. They alledge such miracles, as were done by Papists, in order to the conversion of Heathens to Christianity, which if really done by the cooperation of the divine power, do prove no more but this, That God thereby bare witnesse to the common cause of Christianity, (for confirmation whereof such miracles were done,) and not to their particular opinions, wherein they stand divided from other Christians.

4. They alledge such miracles, as for the generality of them, their own Authors (such of them as have not sacrificed to impudence) acknowledg to be fictitious and ridiculous. What shall I tell you of that known censure of *Melchior Canus*, concerning the Legends of the Saints, (which are the great treasuries of popish miracles, and received by the poor besotted Papists with the same veneration, as the four Gospels) That the *lives of the Saints were written with lesse integrity and faithfulness, than the lives of the Heathen Emperors were written by Heathen authors* [a]. A dear sentence! it cost him the losse of a Car-

[a] *Dolenter hoc dico, ---- multò à Laertio severiùs vitas Philosophorum scriptas, quàm à Christianis vitas sanctorum. ------- Nostri (utique (Scriptores) vel affectibus inservirent, vel de industria quoque multa confingerent, ut eorum me nimirum non solùm pudeat, sed etiam taedeat. Canus in operibus lib. 11, c. 6. p. 533.*

dinals Cap. Agreeable to this was that of *Vives*, that *the Legends were written by a man of a Brasen forehead and a Leaden wit.* I shall forbear further particulars, for it were endlesse to enumerate all the complaints amongst their own Authors, (in whom there were any relicks of candor and conscience) of the fictions in this kind, and the many notable instances of those impious frauds discovered upon the reformation of Religion, which before that time were reputed such certain miracles, that it was sufficient to make a man a Heretick to doubt of the truth of them. I shall adde onely this, that our Adversaries could not possibly do a greater spight to Christianity, nor a greater dishonour to those illustrious and unquestionable miracles done by Christ and his Apostles, in the face of all the world, so as their greatest enemies were forced to acknowledge the verity of them, than to compare with them, and to equal to them their fabulous relations concerning some seeming wonders, commonly done in a corner, and by such who served their own interest in them, and whose evidence was so dark, that the truth of them was questioned by their own friends, as you have now heard: as if their design were to make good that passage of one of their holy Fathers, who called the Gospel, *Fabula Christi*, the Fable of Christ, in that known expression, *How great riches hath this Fable of Christ procured to us!* But if every syllable of what their Fabulists have recorded of their miracles were true, it will stand them in little stead, for the reasons before alleadged, and proved. And therefore I conclude, that the miracles pretended, or done by Papists are no certain and sufficient evidence of their infallibility, and no solid Foundaton for their Faith.

§.22. *Answ.* 6. To which I shall onely adde this word at parting, that if miracles must passe for arguments, I know no reason, but Protestants have as good a Title to them

them as the Church of Rome: For although we do not use to boast of wonders, nor indeed have any need to use that Argument, having such solid evidence and sufficient ground for our Faith in the Holy Scriptures, yet if our adversaries will force us to it, I think our plea is as just as theirs, and we could very easily fill a Volume, not with such fictitious narrations as they stuff their Legends with, but with undoubted Histories of Protestant wonders. If the Antients esteemed the first propagation of Christianity by such contemptible meanes against such potent and universal opposition an eminent miracle, why may we not reckon this for the miracle, that the Reformation of Religion should be carried on by a despicable Monk in despight of all the power, policy, cluelty, flattery, learning of the last Age? we can tell them of miraculous cures of Diseases, and dispossessions of Devils by the prayers of God's people, of certain predictions of Future contingencies by Protestant Ministers, of Miraculous preservations and deliverances of Protestant Princes and Ministers from the Bloudy rage and deep designes of Papists, of eminent and unusuall judgments of God upon Popish Persecutors, of all these there are remarkable instances already extant in Print, and such as the Papists were never able to disprove to this day; so that the Protestant cause is not inferiour to the Romish in this particular, but onely here are two things evident in Protestants, which are not so in their Adversaries, *viz.* 1. The Modesty of the Protestants, that they do not boast of what they might justly plead. 2. The *αὐτάρκεια*, or self-sufficiency of the Protestant cause, that hath evidence enough in Scripture, and hath Arguments enough and to spare, whereas the penury of the Popish cause forceth them to catch at shadowes for want of substance.

§. 23. Thus I have considered the several pretences of their great Doctors, and all the Pillars upon which this

vast structure of the Churches Infallibility depends: I have stated the severall pretensions in the words of their own most approved Authors. I have weighed (I think I may say) all their considerable arguments by which they seek to maintain them in the ballance of the Sanctuary, and have found them light. I shall close this particular with a brief reflection upon the whole matter, and the diverse and repugnant courses of their learned Authors in the resolution and Foundation of their Faith, wherein we shall see these miserable creatures running (like the false Prophet in *Jeremy*) from chamber to chamber to hide themselves.

1. They made a bold venture at Scripture, and fairly offer'd to try their cause by it, for which they deserve this Motto,—*Magnis tamen excidit ausis*: But their own brethren pull'd them by the ear, and told them that would not do their work:- *Gainsayers can never be convinced out of Scripture, therefore you must confound them with Tradition*, saies their great *Salmeron*[a]: And they soon found that to be true, which once a Popish Clergyman said, when he had found a Bible; *He knew not who was the Author of it, but sure he was, it was some pestilent Heretick, for he every where condemnes the Doctrines of our Church.*

2. They fly to the Fathers, and their infallible Authority: There upon a fair Tryal they are beaten out of the field. Upon debate they find the Fathers so ἀυτοσχέδιος so uncertain in some things, so positive against them in other things, that they presently cry *Crucifige* to those, whose ears had rung with *Hosanna*'s before, and down goes the infallibility of the Fathers.

(a) *Protervire volentes Scripturis refelli non possunt, ideo una traditionae jugulandi sunt. Salmeron in tom. 13. lib. 1. comment. super Epistolam Pauli.*

3. Then

3. Then they flie to Councels, and by all means they must be infallible; well, the Protestants follow them thither: That point comes to be scann'd. Instances are given of the errour of Councels (if either Papists or Protestants may be Judges:) And (which had the greatest hand in the deposing of Councels) several notable passages are alleadged out of Councels against the Popes Supremacy, and diverse of the present Doctrines of the Romish Church: And upon the hearing of the cause, the Popes himself, and the most of the learned and considerable Papists now in the World, are resolved to trust Councels no longer with this jewel, and not content to deny, they dispute down the Infallibility of Councels, as I have shewed.

4. Then they flie to the Pope for help, and Jesuites cry out ἕυρηκα, they have found the man that is infallible; Now *saltat senex, salva res est.* Well, the Protestants joyne issue with them upon that, give many shrewd instances of the errours of Popes, alledge the expresse words of *Adrianus Sextus*, a Pope confessing the Fallibility of Popes, (whom *Bellarmine* himself reckons among those who hold that the Pope may be an Heretick and teach Heresie (a). And besides all this, two popish approved Councels are pleaded, *viz. Constance* and *Basil*, who absolutely deny the Pope's Supremacy and Infallibility. Well, what shall they do next?

5. Then there must be another device, a coalition of Pope and Councel, and those meeting together are infallible.

Thus Infallibility is but a short-lived businesse, and dies at the expiration of the Councel (for when they are dissolved, their Writings as well as those of Holy

(a) *Lib. 4. De Romano Pontifice cap. 2. & Secunda sententia.*

Scripture are uncapable of being a judge. And thus they have devised an infallibility, made of a commixion of two Fallibles, an ingenious invention it is, by which one may make an infinite of two Finites, and of two guilty persons make up one innocent) But this also is destroyed by themselves. For although the divided parties seem to patch up an agreement, yet indeed they are as much at variance as ever. For the Jesuites make the Pope alone infallible, (and the Councel onely in dependance upon him.) And their Adversaries ascribe this infallibility to the Councel alone, (and to the Pope onely by communication from them,) And so they are both gone by the Arguments already mentioned under each of those heads. And if we may believe either, there is security in neither. And besides all these, diverse of their late Learned Writers reject the infallibility both of Pope and Councels, as *White, Holden, Cressy*, Sir *Kenelme Digby* &c. who assert that neither one nor other, are further infallible then they keep to the Golden rule of Tradition, and in that sense every Christian (*viz.* so far as he keeps to Tradition) is infallible.

6. The next device is oral Tradition, and the Authority of the present Church, who are therefore right because they say so. So this is a confirmation of their Faith answerable to his confutation, who answered all *Bellarmines* works with saying *Mentiris Bellarmine Bellarmine* thou lyest, In like manner do these men confute all the Protestant Writers, and maintain their own Tenents, by saying, *rectè dicis Domine Papa* or *mater Ecclesia*, that the Pope and present Church are in the right. Thus their bare assertion must passe for a solid demonstration, & their pretence that they hold nothing but what they had from the Apostles must be admitted as a proof that it is so, & shadowes must go for substances. But this, besides the ridiculousness of begging the question, and craving what they

they cannot prove, is denied by the greatest pillars of their own Church, and such as with whom the Authors of this new and wild Fancy, will not compare themselves either for number or quality: For this is the known and most approved Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that Tradition and Scripture both are two dead Letters, and partial rules; and there is besides these required a living Judge, endued with supreme and infallible authority, and without this judge we cannot infallibly understand, and are not bound to receive and believe either the one or the other.

7. At last they are so hard put to it, that they cannot leap out of the Circle, nor extricate themselves out of that Labyrinth in which their conceit of infallibility hath involved them, without Miracles: in come the marks of the Church and the glory of miracles. And thus farre I shall discharge them from that invincible difficulty of proving the truth of their most famous Miracles, for if they can prove the infallibility of their Church, I will give it under my hand that they can work a miracle; For then they can reconcile contradictions, and they can do that which the ineffectual essayes of all their greatest wits have shewed to be above the wit of man, or Devil either, (for doubtlesse those Popes who had Familiar acquaintance with the Devil, would not fail to take in his advice and assistance for the defence of their Infallibility) and therefore must needs be acknowledged for δυναστροι or workers of miracles. Thus I have dispatched their several pretences, and shewed the nullity of them all, and consequently the nullity of their Faith.

§. 4. 24. There is only one thing to be added: They have one Argument more, which (although if their other cords break, they acknowledge this will not hold, yet because they use much to insist upon it) I shall consider in a few words: And that is an Argument taken from the pro-

vidence of God, and his care over the Church. It is fit and necessary (say they) that there should be some Infallible Judge that could finally end all controversies, and therefore there in such a one, and they are that judge. I know no man in the world can leap further at three jumps. 1. There ought to be. 2. There is an infallible Judge. 3. Their Church is it.

§. 25. *Answ.* 1. Why may not I turn their Argument upon them? God hath not provided such a Judge, *Ergo* such a Judge is not necessary. When God thought fit to appoint a Judge for the decision of some controversies in the old Testament, he thought fit to expresse the person, the place, his work, his power: And if the Popish doctrine be true, that this judge is of such necessity, that without him we cannot understand, and are not bound to believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, and that submission to this Judge is necessary to Salvation; it is ten thousand times more incredible that God (to whom all our present controversies were not unforeseen) should not leave us some mention of it in those Scriptures which are written for this end, *that we might believe*, John 20. 31. *and that we might be made wise unto Salvation*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. than that such a Judge is necessary. If God had but said instead of Tell the Church, Tell the Bishop of Rome, or hear the Bishop of Rome in all things, all those infinite and dreadfull distractions, divisions, persecutions, errours and mischiefes, which have since risen in the world, had been prevented. So if reason may be judge, who can believe it consistent with the goodness of God, or Christs care over his Church, or Gods design in giving the Scriptures, to omit such a necessary point as this, upon which all the rest had depended; especially when Doctrines of far less concernment are there plainly recorded and often repeated?

§. 26.

§. 26. *Ans.* 2. If once men suffer their understandings to mount so high as to reach God what is fit, and positively to conclude that to be done which they judge fit to be done, it opens a gap to Atheisme and to all imaginable Superstition. What a fine modell of Divinity should we have if once this door were open'd? It was fit that all the Translators of the Bible should have infallible guidance, that they might not mistake in a letter: It was fit that the Doctrine of the Popes Supremacy and Infallibility should have been ingraven upon every mans heart, or at least plainly revealed in the Bible, this being of more use than all the Bible besides; (since the Pope could have supplied the want of a Bible) And as *Chillingworth* well argues, it was as fit that every Minister should have been infallible; that all the Popes should be free from grosse wickednesse; (as all other infallible persons recorded in Scripture were:) It was fit that obstinate Hereticks should be consumed with fire from Heaven: Therefore by this Argument all these things are done. How much better and more becomming is it for a Christian to say with the Apostle, *who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his Counseller?* Rom. 11. 33. than boldly to measure God by our own fancies, and tie him to our fond imaginations.

§. 27. 3. If it be granted that there is an infallible judge, yet it doth not their work, for particular Christians are not infallibly assured of the Infallibility of their Church, (unlesse they will say that every Papist is Infallible;) And therefore no particular Papist hath better ground for his Faith upon this score than the Protestants have: for they neither have nor pretend to better Arguments, upon which they believe their Church to be this Supreme and infallible judge, than what Protestants alledge to prove the Scripture to be judge, *viz.* Texts of Scripture, Tradition, Fathers, Councels, Miracles, rationall Arguments,

Arguments, *&c.* And if a Protestant may be deceived in these when he infers from them the infallibility of the Scripture: why may not a Papish be deceived when he inferres from them the infallibility of his Church, since he hath no better Arguments, nor more infallible guidance? And therefore as to particular Christians (of whom the whole Church consists, and about whom alone the care of Christ and Gods Providence is exercised) God hath not taken more effectual care for their infallible guidance according to the Romish Principles than according to ours: For as they say, Protestants have no security for their Faith, though the Scripture be infallible, because they cannot infallibly understand it, or believe this to be the Scripture: so say I, the Papists have no security of the infallibility of their Church (though the Churches infallibility be acknowledged true in it self) since they cannot infallibly know either that there is such an infallibility, or theirs to be the Church to whom it is promised.

§. 24. 4. It is neither necessary, nor suitable to the methods of Gods Providence and the declarations of his will, that there should be a finall end and infallible judge of all controversies in this life: That which these men tell us was fit to be done, God hath told us he did not judge fit (and who is most credible, do you judge) *1 Cor.* 11. 19. *There must be Heresies – that they which are approved may be made manifest.* God hath acquainted us, that it is his pleasure that Tares should grow with the Wheat until the end of the World. In respect of wicked men it was fit (in regard of Gods Justice) that there should be stones of stumbling and Rocks of offence, for the punishment of those that were disobedient: And in regard of elect and sincere Christians, who live holily, and humbly believe, and pray fervently, and seek the true way diligently, such a judge is not necessary, God having provided for

them

them other wayes, by giving them the promise of his Spirit, and guidance into Truth, (which is as good security as the Pope himselfe hath, or pretends for his supposed infallibility) by that anointing which teacheth them all things, 1 *Joh.* 2. 27. in confidence of whose conduct they may say with *David*, *Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel and afterwards receive me to Glory*, Psal. 73. 24. They are kept by Gods power, 1 *Pet.* 1. 5. and the care and strength of Christ, *Joh.* 10. And what need a Christian desire more? Truly saith *Ameſius*, *God hath provided for the safety of the Godly, not for the curiosity and perverſneſſe of other men.* And therefore this plea must go after all the rest, and they are still left in a forlorne and desperate, because in a faithlesse, condition: And thus having forced my way through all the obstructions which they laid before us: I know not what hinders, but I may pronounce the sentence, notwithstanding all their big looks and glorious pretences of Infallibility, notwithstanding all the noise of Scripture, Fathers, Popes, Councels, Tradition, Miracles; when things come to be scanned, it appears they have no foundation for their Faith, and consequently have no Faith. Lord be mercifull to them.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Solidity of the Protestant foundation of Faith.

§. 1. HAppily they will say of us, as *Jerome* did of *Lactantius*, that he could *facilius aliena destruere, quam stabilire sua*, that we can more easily overthrow the foundation of their Faith, than make our own

own good: I shall therefore (though it be besides my present designe, which is onely to undeceive the world in that great cheat of Infallibility) in few words enquire whether the Protestants have not a better and more solid foundation of their Faith, than the Papists have: And this I shall shew only by one Argument.

The Popish foundation of faith is such, as many of their own great Doctors are unsatisfied in; (There being no foundation laid by any of them, but it is both denied, and disproved by others no lesse eminent of their own communion, (as I have proved at large and such as is unanimously opposed by all Protestants and solidly disproved:) But the Protestants foundation of Faith is such as all Protestant Churches (of what denomination soever) are agreed in, yea such as diverse of our most learned Adversaries acknowledg to be solid and sufficient. You will say, if you can prove this, the controversie will be at an end, and if I do not, let the Reader judge. There are but three things that need proof. 1. That the Books of Scripture (which Protestants build their Faith upon) are, and may be proved to be the word of God. 2. That in the substantials of Faith these Books are uncorrupted. 3. That the sence of Scripture may be sufficiently understood in necessary points.

§. 2. For the first: That the Protestants Bible is, and may be proved to be the word of God. It is true, when they meet with any of our Novices they use to put this perplexing question (as they call it) to them. How know you Scripture to be the word of God? what matters it how I know it, seeing they acknowledge it, and by granting the thing make their question superfluous? But I Answer, I know it even by the confession of our Adversaries: So they acknowledge and own the verity and solidity of our foundation; and the testimony of an adversary against himself is undeniable. It may be of good use

use here a little to compare the several discourses of learned Papists to different persons, and how prettily they contradict themselves, and confute their own arguments. When the Papists dispute against us, they tell us, it is impossible to know the Scripture to be the word of God, but by the Churches Testimony. But if you take them in their lucid intervals, and their disputes against Atheists, or Heathens, then you shall have them in another tune: then *Bellarmine* can say, *Nothing is more evident, and more certain than the sacred Scriptures, so that he must needs be a very fool that denies faith to them* (a). Here he can furnish us with several arguments to prove the authority of the Scripture (distinct from, and independent upon the Churches authority,) the variety of Prophecies, harmony of writers, works of Providence, glory of Miracles, consent of Nations, *&c.* Either then these arguments do solidly prove the Divine authority of the Scriptures, or they do not: if they do not, then *Bellarmine* is a Baffler to use fallacious arguments, and a lyar too, having said, *nothing more evident, nothing more certain*: if they do, then the Scriptures may be evidenced to be the word of God without the Churches Testimony, which they so boldly deny at other times. The like might I shew out of *Gregory de Valentia*, who musters up diverse convincing arguments, whereby even Heathens may be satisfied, that the Scripture is the word of God without the aid of the Churches authority (b). And the like is done by several of their learned and approved Authors: from which it plainly appears, That the foundation of Christianity and Protestancy is one and the same, and that we have the same argu-

(a) *At sacris Scripturis, quæ continentur in Prophetici & Apostolicis literis nihil est notius, nihil certius, ut stultissimum esse necesse sit, qui illis fidem habendam esse neget.* De verbo Dei *lib.* 1. *c.* 2.

(b) *Analys. fidei. lib.* 1. *c.* 3.

ments

ments and evidences for the ground of our Faith as Protestants, (*viz.* for the Divine authority of the Scriptures independently upon the Churches testimony) which we have as Christians, and that the Papists cannot say nor do any thing towards the subversion of the Faith of the Reformed Churches herein, but at the same time, and by the same art and arguments, they must oppugne the Christian cause, and acknowledge it untenable against a subtle Pagan or Atheist. And I desire the Reader to consider that this is not an answer or argument *ad hominem*, which I now insist upon, but fetched from the nature of the thing, and the verity of the Christian Religion. And for what they pretend. That without the Churches Testimony we cannot know that S. *Mathews* Gospel was written by him, and so the rest: they shall take an Answer of a very eminent and approved Author of their own, *Melchior Canus*: *It is not much material to the Catholick Faith, that any book was written by this or that Author, so long as the Spirit of God is believed to be the Author of it: which* Gregory *learnedly delivers, and explaines; For it matters not with what pen the King writes his Letter, if it be true that he writ it* (a).

§. 3. The second thing is, That the Books of Scripture are not corrupt in the essential and necessary points of Faith. This a man may easily discern by looking into the nature and quality of those various lections, which are pleaded as evidences of corruption, where he shall quickly find them generally to be in matters of lesse moment, and such upon which Salvation doth not depend. But because the examination of this would be a tedious work

(a) *Deinde librum esse hujus aut illius Scriptoris non admodum interest Catholicæ fidei, dummodo Spiritus sanctus author esse credatur. Quas Gregorius erudite tradit & explicat: nec enim refert, qua penna, Regia Epistolam scripserit, si verè scripsit.* de locis Theolog. l. 2. c. 11. p. 75.

I shall save my self and Reader the labour, and shall prove it in general (as at first I proposed) from the confession of those of their own Brethren, (which out of a prepostrous respect of the vulgar Translation, assert the malitious corruption of the Hebrew Text, and positively maintain the incorruption of the Bible in matters of importance. Of this opinion are among the Papists, *Bellarmine, Arias Montanus, Driedo, Bannes, Tena, Acosta, Lorinus*, and diverse others: If you please, we will hear the fore-man of the Jury speak for the rest. *I confesse* (saith he) *that the Scriptures are not altogether pure, they have some errors in them; but they are not of such moment, that the Scripture is defective in things that belong to faith and manners. For for the most part, those differences and various lections consist in some words which make little or no difference in the Text* (a). To whom I will adde the acknowledgment of a late Author S. *Clara*, whose words are these: *Considering a moral thing morally, it is altogether impossible, that the Books of the New Testament were or are considerably adulterated* (b). And so he goes on, proving what he had asserted. This may suffice for the second thing.

§. 4. For the third particular, (which alone now remains in doubt) concerning the sense of Scripture, My as-

---

(a) *Scripturæ non sunt omnino integræ, ac puræ, sed habent suos quosdam errores. Cæterum non tanti momenti sunt ejusmodi errores, ut in iis, quæ ad fidem & mores pertinent, Scripturæ sacræ integritas desideretur. Plerumque enim tota discrepantia variarum lectionum in dictionibus quibusdam posita est, quæ sensum aut parum aut nihil mutant. De verbo Dei l. 2. c. 2. versus finem.*

(b) *Rem moralem, moraliter considerando, planè impossibile est libros præsertim Novi Testamenti fuisse vel esse notaliter adulteratos. System. fidei c. 11. n. 8.*

sertion

sertion is this: A Protestant hath or may have a sufficient assurance of understanding the sence of Scripture in things necessary to salvation. This I shall briefly prove by this argument: Gods promise is sufficient assurance, (the Papists do not pretend an higher assurance for their Churches infallibility) but a Protestant is, or may be assured of this by Gods promise, as appears from *Joh* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.* Protestants have the assurance of Reason, and whatever the Papists talk, they have no other. It is true, they talke of several things, Fathers, Councels, Tradition, Motives of Credibility, &c. but in these and all other argrments, both Papists and Protestants agree in this, that when they go to settle and satisfie their consciences, though they hear many things, yet reason weighs them all, and rejects what it judgeth false, and holds fast what it esteemeth true and good: if that will not do, they have the assurance of the Spirit, which God hath promised to those that ask it, *Luk* 11.13. and this is as much as the Church her self pretends. In a word, to strike the business dead, you shall see the perspicuity and evidence of the Scriptures, in things necessary to salvation, acknowledged by our Adversaries, from whom the force of Truth extorted these confessions: *That part of Scripture is plain and evident, which contains the first & chief principles of things to be believed, and the principall rules of living*: so *Sextus Senensis* (a). *We deny not, that the chief articles of faith, which are necessary to salvation to all Christians, are plainly evough comprehended in the writings of the Apostles*: so *Costerus* (b). And *Salmeron*,

a *Illam Scripturæ partem apertam & dilucidam esse, quæ prima summáque rerum credendarum præcipia ac principua vivendi præcepta complectitur, Biblioth. sanct. lib. 6. Annot. 151.*

(b) *Non inficiamur præcipua illa fidei Capita, quæ omnibus Christianis cognita sunt ad salutem necessaria, perspicuè satis esse Apostolicis scriptis comprehensa, in Enchirid p. 48.*

having

having said, that all Doctrines and Traditions are to be examined by Scripture, he saith, *The Scripture is so framed and ordered by God, that it might be accommodated to all places, times, persons, difficulties, dangers, diseases, to drive away evil, to procure good, to overthrow errors, to establish truths, to instill virtue, to expell vice* [a]. And *Hieronymus of Oleastro* saith, *We are to praise God for it, that those things which are necessary to salvation, he hath made easie* [b]. From all these things put together, I think I may say, it undeniably followes, (which I proposed to evince,) That the Foundation of a Protestants Faith is solid and sufficient, our Adversaries themselves being Judges.

§. 5. Onely I must remove one block out of the way. Peradventure they will say, that if all these things be true concerning the word of God in its own Language, yet there is one notorious defect in the groundwork of the Protestants Faith, *viz.* That they build it upon the credit of a Translation, made by persons confessedly fallible. This, because they make such a noise with it amongst ignorant and injudicious persons, (however to men of understanding it is but an impertinent discourse) it will be convenient to say something to it, and but a little. To this then I answer. 1. The Papists cannot in reason charge us with that fault, of which themselves are equally guilty; nor can they accuse our Faith of that infirmity, to which their own is no lesse obnoxious: for the generality of unlearned Papists in the world have nothing but a Translation, or, which is worse, a meer Report, for the Founda-

(a) *Scriptura sic est à spiritu sancto concinnata, atque contexta, ut omnibus locis, temporibus, personis, difficultatibus, periculis, morbis, malis pellendis, bonis accersendis, erroribus jugulandis, dogmatibus statuendis, virtutibus inserendis, vitiis propulsandis sit accommodata.* Salmeron in Prolog. 1.

(b) *Gratificandum Deo valdè quod, quæ sunt necessaria ad salutem, facilia fecit, super Deut.* 30.

tion of their Faith. If their suppositions were admitted, that the Pope or Councel is the infallible judge of Controversies, and that their Decrees are of undoubted verity, yet forasmuch as it is the lot of very few Papists to be eye or ear-witnesses of them, they are forced to receive the rules of their Faith, (*i.e.* the decrees of Popes or Councels) either from the meer reports of such men, whom they acknowledge fallible, unless they will (as indeed they may upon as good grounds, having once fallen into the humour of inventing) devise infallible Notions, as well as an infallible Judge, or at best, if they be transmitted to them in writing, yet since they are written in a strange language, and unknown to vulgar Papists, they cannot understand them but by a Translation. And consequently the case of vulgar Protestants, who rely upon a Translation of the Decrees of holy Scripture, is not one jot inferior to that of vulgar Papists, who rely upon a Translation of the Popes decrees.

§. 6. *Ans.* 2. Those Protestants that understand not the original languages, have a sufficient Foundation of their Faith in the Translations they enjoy, and that for two reasons. 1. They have so great a moral assurance of the verity of their Translation in all matters of moment, that no man can doubt of it, that is not within one remove of madness: and this is such a certainty, as the Papists have no reason to quarrel with. It is the observation of a grave author of their own, *Those things are certain amongst men, which cannot be denied without perverseness and folly* (a). And again, *Such things as are delivered by common consent of Histories, it is a most foolish*

a *Certa apud homines ea sunt, quæ negari sine pervicacia & stultitia non possunt. Canus loc. com. lib.* 11. *de humanæ historiæ authoritate c.* 4. *p.*468.

thing

thing either to deny them, or doubt of them (a). Now to apply this. A man may have as great an humane aſſurance as is poſſible of the verity of our Tranſlations by the collation of differing Tranſlations, made by ſeveral perſons in diverſe times and places, and they too in ſeveral languages, and ſometimes by men of oppoſite principles in Religion, yet all agreeing in the main, by the impoſſibility of a deſign among ſome learned men to cheat the vulgar by a falſe Tranſlation, there being ſo many watchful eyes upon them in every Tranſlation, ſo little benefit by ſuch a deceit, ſuch extreme danger and diſgrace attending upon it, ſuch improbability of any ſucceſſe: by the ridiculouſneſſe and impertinency of Popiſh exceptions againſt our Tranſlations, (as may be ſeen in the diſcourſes between Dr *Fulk* and *Gregory Martin* upon that Subject) being in the groſſe ſo inconſiderable, that if all were granted they deſire, we need nothing elſe to confute them but their own *Doway* Bible, or *Rhemiſh* Teſtament, and ſeveral other wayes. In a word, the Papiſts themſelves have not ſo good ſecurity for that, upon which all their Religion & Infallibility depends, *viz.* whether *Alexander* the 7th be a regular Pope; for if he be not a Prieſt, which he is not, ſay the Papiſts, if his Ordainer did not intend to make him a Prieſt, (and who knows another mans intentions?) or if there was any Symony in his election to the Popedome, (which how is it poſſible for us to be aſſured that there was not?) in which caſe by their own profeſſion the Election is null, and all the actions done by him afterward: ſo till they have better fortified their own Faith, I am ſure they have no reaſon to quarrel with ours.

(a) *Plurima ſunt ejuſmodi, quæ communi hiſtoricorum conſenſione traduntur. Hæc non modo negare, ſed in his etiam addubitare, ſtultiſſimum eſt.* ibid.

§. 7. 2. There is more then a moral assurance, even a Divine Faith of the verity of that Scripture which is contained in our Translations. For whereas, amongst other arguments alleadged by Christians, and owned by the Papists themselves, they urge the Majesty of the Stile, the sublimity of the matter, the efficacy of the Doctrine, and its influence into the hearts of men, (of which *Gregory de Valentia* saith, *I know not whether it be a greater argument for the Scriptures than all the rest, yea than miracles, confession of adversaries,* &c.) [a]. Now the power of these arguments is not confined to the Original languages, but common to true Translations: For it is not the shell of the words, but the kernel of the matter which commends it self to the consciences of men, and that is the same in all Languages. The Scripture in English, nor lesse than in Hebrew or Greek, displaies its lustre, and exerts its power, and discovers the Characters of its Divine original. The most unlearned Christians do ordinarily feel such a supernatural force in the Scriptures, (though conveyed to them only in a Translation,) they find in themselves, and observe in others such a sharpnesse and energy, in oft times convincing the proudest sinners, converting the most profligate Wretches, comforting the most distressed consciences, that it forceth them to say, *Non vox hominem sonat*, God is in this Scripture of a truth. When a man finds the Law of God in English, *converting the soul, and enlightning the eyes,* (which was *David*'s argument for its Divinity, *Psal.* 19.) when men feel the Scripture in the English Translation *quick and powerfull, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the Heart:* (which was S *Pauls* argument *Heb.* 12.)

(a) *Anal. fidei lib.* 2. c. 20.

and

and so I might instance in diverse other properties: what can they infer, but that it is the voice of God, though he speaks by an Interpreter, that it is the water of life, though conveyed to them in the glasse of a Translation.

§ 8. *Answ.* 3 At worst, this may fully stop their mouths, that the argument doth not touch the merits of the cause, nor shake the Foundation of our Faith, but only concerns some particular person, *viz.* such as are ignorant of, and unlearned in the original languages. So the defect lies in the persons, not in the cause, nor in the ground-work of our Faith, but in the neglects of some men, to build up themselves fully upon it, If any man be unsatisfied with Translation, he hath under God a remedy in his own hands: if he like not the Cistern, he may go to the Fountain, if he will take the paines of so long a journey. A little industry, and diligent use of those meanes and helps which are offered even to vulgar Christians, will wholly remove this difficulty, and put a period to this argument.

§ 9. I shall conclude this discourse with the consideration of two particulars. The first is an objection they urge against the solidity of our Faith. The second, is one plea more they have for the solidity of their own. The first is an objection, which they frequently urge in all their Treatises: That circular way of argument, which we justly object against them, they boldly retort upon us, and tell us, that we have no way to prove the Scripture but by the spirits testimony, and no way to prove the Spirits testimony, but the Scripture This is counted one of the hardest knots. and therefore it will be worth the while in few words to unty it, though it may seem a little heterogeneous to my present design.)

§ 10. 1. They have no reason to object this circle to us, that they cannot free themselves from. I speak not now of the other famous Circle of the Church and Scrip-

ture, (which their most learned Authors of late have ingenuously confessed,) but here is another Circle: The Papists have *Circulum in Circulo.* For they professe a man cannot know the Church, but by the Spirit, nor the Spirit but by the Church: That a man cannot know the Spirit, nor the mind of the Spirit, nor distinguish it from false and counterfeit ones, but by the Church, is their great principle: *He cannot know it* (say they) *by the Scripture, unlesse he read it with the Churches Spectacles*; Revelation they do not pretend to, therefore this is known onely by the Church, (to whom the discerning of Spirits belongs,) and by others onely from the Churches authority, and infallible Testimony. But that is a clear case: the onely doubt lies about the other Branch, *viz.* That a man (according to their principles) cannot know the Church but by the Spirit: and that you shall have under the hands of their great Masters. *Stapleton's* words are these: *This secret Testimony is altogether necessary, that a man may believe the Churches judgment and testimonie about the approbation of the Scriptures, neither will Faith follow without this inward Testimonie of the Spirit of God, although the Church attest, commend, publish, approve the Scripture a thousand times over*[a]. So *Canus* tels us, that *Humane authority, and other motives, are not sufficient inducements to believe, but there is moreover a necessity of an inward efficient cause, i.e. the special help of God moving us to believe*[b]. What can be more plaine? Let them an-

---

a *Arcanum hoc testimonium necessarium prorsus est, ut quis Ecclesiæ testimonia ac judicia circa Scripturarum approbationem credat, neque absque hoc interno Divini Spiritus testimonio, etiamsi millies Ecclesia attestetur, commendet, promulget, approbet Scripturas, fides consequetur* Defens. contra Whitak. lib. 1. c. 1.

b *Statuendum est authoritatem humanam & incitamenta omnia illa prædicta, sive alia quæcunque adhibita ab eo qui proponit fidem, non esse sufficientes causas ad credendum, ut credere tenemur; sed præterea opus est interiori causa efficiente, i.e. Dei speciali auxilio moventis ad credendum,* Loc. Theol. lib. 2. c. 8.

swer

swer themselves, and that will serve our turn. Either they must leave themselves in the Circle, or help us out. *Jam summus ergo pares.* And it is unreasonable, that they should urge that as a peculiar inconvenience, of our Resolution of Faith, to which their own is no lesse obnoxious.

§. 11. 2. It is false, that we have no other way to prove the Scripture to be the word of God, but the Spirits internal Testimony. They cannot be ignorant, that we have diverse arguments of another nature, and independent upon that Testimony of the Spirit, by which the authority of Scripture is solidly proved. And Papists as well as Protestants have substantially defended the cause of the Scriptures against Pagans and Atheists. Either those arguments are solid, rational, and convincing, or they are not: If they say, they are not; then be it known to all men by these presents, that the Assertors of Popery are the Betrayers of Christianity: If they be, then is the Scripture proved other wayes, than by the Spirits testimony. How can our Adversaries vindicate themselves, either from shameful ignorance, if they do not know, or abominable malice, if they wittingly bely us, that we have no argument to prove the Scripture, but the Testimonie of the Spirit. What, are those glorious miracles, by which the Scripture was sealed and propagated, now become no argument? Is the Transcendency of the matter, and majesty of the Style, and admirable power of the Word of none effect, to prove the Scriptures Divinity? Are not the patience of Martyrs, the concurring testimony of Jewes and Heathens to the truth of Scripture-relations, the verity of predictions, and the like, as solid arguments now, as they were in the primitive times, when the Fathers confounded the learnedest Pagans by these and such like arguments? If they be (as they must affirme, unlesse they will turn perfect Pagans, as they are in the half way to it already,) then their Assertion is false, That

we cannot prove the Divinity of the Scripture but by the spirits Testimony, and the Circle which they impute to us, is indeed in their own Brain, and their Argument is the fruit of their Vertigo.

§. 12. 3. Here is no Circle, because, although the Spirit and Scripture do mutually prove one another, yet they do it *in diverso genere*, in diverse wayes, and several capacities: but a Circle is, when a man proceeds *ab eodem ad idem eodem modo cognitum*, when a mans knowledg proceeds from the same thing to the same thing in the same way. But in this case, though the thing be the same, yet the way of knowledge varies, and that breaks the Circle. The Scripture proves the Spirit *per modum objecti & argumenti*, objectively, and by way of argument, by suggesting such truths to me, from which I may collect the verities of the Spirit, and prove its Divinity. But the Spirit proves, or rather approves the Scripture *per modum causæ effectivæ & instrumenti*, as a Divine instrument infused into the soul, whereby I am enabled to apprehend such verities as are contained in the Scripture. The Papists indeed cannot get out of their Circle of Church and Scripture, because each of them is the argument by which they prove the other: the argument, nay the only argument (say they) for which I believe the Scripture, is the authority of the Church testifying it: and the argument for which they believe the Church, is the authority of the Scripture. And here the Circle is so grosse and evident, that it is acknowleged by diverse of their own late learned Authors. *Holden* confesseth in expresse termes, that they who resolve their Faith in this manner (and so do almost all the learned Papists in the world) *do unavoidably fall into a Circle*(a). So the late Answe-

(a) *In Circulum hunc inevitabiliter illabuntur, & in orbem turpissimè saltantes &c. Holden de resolut. fidei lib. c. 9.*

re-

ter of Bishop *Lawd* confesseth, *it is a vitious Circle to prove Scripture from the Churches Tradition, and the Churches Tradition from Scripture* (a), (as they generally do, some few Excentrical spirits excepted:) nor can he get out of it, but by returning to that Vomit, which his former Masters had discharged themselves from, *viz.* to prove infallibility by miracles, and the motives of credibility. But in our case it is quite otherwise, for the Spirit works *ut instrumentum*, by way of Instrument, the Scripture, *ut argumentum*, by way of Argument. It were an absurd aspersion to call this a Circle, if any man should say? I believe the Sun to be bigger than the Earth, because my reason tels me it is so, and I believe my reason saith true, because Mathematical arguments convince me it must needs be so. That which frees this discourse from the Circle, is, that the Mathematicks prove it, *ut argumentum*, Reason proves it *ut instrumentum*: and the same may be said in the present case. I shall farther illustrate this by a similitude or two: It is here, as when a man through the infirmity of his eye, apprehends a thing to be lesse than it is. There are three wayes, whereby this man may be convinced of his error: By argument taken from the thing it self. 2. By bringing the object nearer to the Eye, (which was at too great a distance) whereby it appears in its due proportion. 3. By curing the infirmity of the eye. Thus the Physitian that removes the distemper of the eye, and restores it to its native strength and vigor, may be said to convince him. Now to apply this. The Spirit of God doth not convince a man of the Divinity of the Scriptures the first way, as a Philosopher, but the last way as a Physitian; not by an elucidation of the object by arguments, but by the eleva-

(a) Lawd's *Labyrinth*, *chap.* 5.

tion

tion of the faculty, or by anointing the eyes with eye-salve, and curing its infirmity. To which the second may be added, *viz.* That the Spirit of God brings his word, and the characters of its Divinity impressed upon it, nearer unto us, and writes in the heart according to Gods promise to that purpose, and so we see the object better, by reason of its approximation to us. Or as it is with a Philosopher, when he reads a Book, written in the defence of some position, (as suppose the doctrine of the circulation of the Bloud,) possibly his mind may be discomposed, and his Braines by reason of some peccant humor much distemper'd, and in this case he read the Book, but is not at all satisfied by it: afterwards, Physical means are applied, whereby the brain is restored to its native constitution, and purged from those distempers, whereby it was clouded: now he returns to the book again, and reads it over anew, and yields himself captive to the opinion. You see here is no change of the old arguments, nor any addition of new ones; onely the impediments which were in the faculty, or the organ, are removed. Just so it is in the matter now in controversie: The Spirit of God doth not prove the Scripture to me by arguments, which I never had before, but by the illumination of my mind, to apprehend the arguments which I did not apprehend before. It is with men, as it was with *Hagar Gen.* 21: there was a Well of water, but she saw it not till God open'd her eyes, *verse* 19. There is a self-evidencing light in the Scriptures, onely the Spirit of God cures that blindness of mind, whereby the Devil hindred the world from discerning it. Thus the Spirit convinced the Jewes of the Truth of the Gospel by removing the vaile, which was upon their hearts in the reading of *Moses*, 2 Cor. 3. 15, 16. And so God convinced his elect among the Heathens, not by discovering any more arguments to them, than he did to the reprobates among

them,

them, for the same doctrine and arguments were preached to both alike, but by opening their eyes to see what others saw not, *Act.*26.18. and by opening their hearts to receive what others would not receive, as *Act.*16.14. To conclude, forasmuch as the testimony of the Spirit is not the Argument for which, but onely the Instrument by which they believe; and on the contrary, the Testimony of Scripture is the proper argument for which they believe, it is most evident, that they work in several capacities, and so we are fully discharged from that Circle, which they causlesly charge us with, and notwithstanding this objection, the foundation of our Faith standeth sure. This is the first particular.

§.13. The other particular concernes the Popish foundation: for some of the Romanists finding themselves so wofully intangled in the businesse of infallibility, are grown sick of the notion. *Cressy*, the English Apostate, in his *Exomologesis* confesseth, That *Infallibility is an unfortunate word, combated by* Mr Chillingworth *with too great successe, that he could wish the word were forgotten, or at least laid by*: these therefore tell us, that if the Infallibility of the Church be denied, yet a Papist hath sufficient ground for his faith in the Churches authority, in which he is obliged to acquiesce, and whom he must hear in all things: and this way some others go. This I thought fit to mention, that the world may see the complexion of a Romish conscience, and the desperate shifts which the wretchednesse of their cause forceth them to. But because the absurdity of this new fancy doth *suâ luce constare*, I shall dismisse it with two remarks upon it.

1. That it is disclaimed by the Romish Church, (and it were a frivolous thing to concern our selves in refuting all the wild fancies of their particular Doctors.) It is true *Cressy* saith, *No such word as Infallibility is to be found in any*

any Counsel: the good man had forgot the definition of the Councel of *Basil*, wherein they call it a *pernitious errour, to say, that a Councel can erre*; (the passage I cited before,) or else he meant to be witty, for it is very true, that *non potest errare* is not the same word with *Infallibility*, though it be the same thing. Nor do the Papists onely assert the infallibility of their Church, but generally acknowledge, that without this, their Faith would have no solid foundation, nor their Religion any certainty. I shall not multiply instances in so known a thing: you have many instances in one, in that forementioned passage of the Councel of *Basil*, That *if once that pernitious error were admitted, that generall Councels may erre, the whole Catholick Faith would totter* (a) And *Bellarmine* in a forequoted passage confesseth, That *it is a most unreasonable thing to require Christians to be finally subject to the judgment of that Church which is liable to error* (b). And therefore I need not cast away pretious time in confuting those particular fancies of some private Doctors, which are directly repugnant unto the confessed opinion of the Pope, and the Decree of a general Councel.

2. This is so farre from mending the matter, that it makes it far worse: for he that saith, *I am bound to believe the Church in all things, because she is infallible in all things*, speaks that which is coherent in it selfe, and the consequence is agreeable to reason; the onely fault lies in the Antecedent. But he that saith, I am bound to believe the Church in all things, though she may erre in many things (and none knows how many) throws himself and me upon such desperate Rocks, as none but a mad-man would run upon. When *Bellarmine* delivers that desperate doctrine, That *if the Pope should command us to sin, we are*

(a) *In responsione Synodali.*
(b) *Lib. 2. de Concil. c. 3.*

bound

bound to obey him: and when others have said, That *if the Pope should lead thousands to Hell, we must not reprove him*: their followers mollifie the harshnesse of those assertions with this favourable construction, That the Propositions are onely Hypothetical, depending upon such conditions, as by reason of the promise of Intallibility, can never be fulfilled; for (say they) the Pope cannot command sin, and cannot lead men to Hell: and this, if true were a plausible evasion. But to tell me, that if the Pope or Church may erre, yet I am bound to believe and obey them in all things, this is to make that my duty, which God hath threatned as a terrible Curse, 2 *Thes.* 2. *viz.* to believe lies: This is to confront the Apostle, *Act.* 5. and to say, That *it is better to obey men than God*, when their commands are contrary; this is to bring me under a necessity of that Woe, denounced against such as *call evill good, & good evil, that put darknes for light, & light for darknes*, Isa. 5. 20. This is to say, That I am bound to follow my blind Leaders, though it be into the ditch, that I am under an obligation of offending God by making him a lyar, and of damning my own Soul: This is to say, That the Israelites were bound to obey *Aaron*'s Idolatrous decree, concerning the observation of the Feast of the Calfe: nay more, That the Jewes were bound to obey their Church in putting Christ to death, though they had at that time known him to be the true Messias. In a word, such and so many are the prodigious absurdities which would inevitably follow from that wild assertion, that Madnes it self, unlesse in its highest Paroxysme, could not equal it: and when the Authors of it come to themselves, or return to the judgment of their own Church, or when their Church comes over to their opinion, & layes aside their bold pretences to Infallibility, they may expect a farther Answer.

But since I wrot this, I find, Mr *Cressy* hath saved me the labour of farther Answer: for in his second edition,

(and

(and *secundæ cogitationes sunt meliores*) I find him sick of his former notion: I suppose he hath met with sharp rebukes from his wiser Brethren; what penances or censures they have inflicted on him I know not, but the effect is visible, and the man is brought to a recanting strain. And that he may have some colourable Palliation for it, he pretends, he was mis-understood, and that he never meant to deny Infallibility to the Church, save onely in the most rigorous sense that the Terme could import, and therefore he roundly asserts, *That the Church can neither deceive believers that follow her, nor be deceived her self.* Exomolog. §. 2. Ch. 21. And *Infallibility and Authority are in effect all one as applied to the Church: for to say, that the Church hath authority to oblige all Christians to receive her Doctrines, and withall to say she is fallible, is extremity of Injustice and Tyranny.* Appendix to Exomolog. *cap.* 5. *num.* 14. So this pretence is also gone after the rest: and therefore from all that hath been discoursed and proved, I may take the boldnesse to conclude, That the Faith of a Papist, if he keep to his own principles hath no Foundation, or is not built upon the Rock, but meerly upon the Sand, or (in the Prophets language) *they have forsaken* (the Scriptures) *the fountain of living water, to hew out unto themselves broken Cisterns, that can hold no water.*

An APPENDIX *by way of reflections upon Captain* Robert Everards EPISTLE, *and account of his Conversion and Submission to the* Romish Church; *and* Mr Cressy's EXOMOLOGESIS.

SInce the finishing of the foregoing Treatise, I was told of an Epistolary Discourse of Captaine *Everards*, and withall that the substance of it was fully Answered by what I had there discussed, onely it was convenient to accommodate the passages relating thereto to the several parts of his Epistle: Upon this suggestion I procured the Epistle it self as enlarged in the second Edition, and diligently read it once or twice over: And I confesse I was at first dubious whether I should take any notice of it, partly because I saw it was nothing but a collection out of others (as he most properly calls it) and a repetition of those old Sophismes, that have been answered and exploded an hundred times over, and partly because I discerned by the spirit of the man, and the frame of his Discourse, and the circumstances of his change, that there was no likelihood at all of retriving and reclaiming him, how clear and irresistible soever the evidence and arguments were that should be produced. He that hath but half an Eye may see a designe in the whole management of the change: And although he assures us with a *teste me ipso*, that he is not biassed by worldly interests, and private ends, he must allow discreet persons the liberty of their

Faith

Faith in that particular, and not take it amisse, if seeming the feebleneſſe of his Arguments, and their inſufficiency for the producing of ſuch a change, they ſuſpect it was done by the power of intereſt, which is ſo ſecret an affaire, and its method ſo crypticall, and the wayes of ſerving it ſo various, that no wiſe man will believe it impoſſible, and I am ſure the contexture of his Diſcourſe, and the manner of his proceſſe doth not render it at all incredible: And theſe conſiderations inclined me to ſilence. But on the other ſide, when I conſidered, that the hand of *Joab* ſufficiently appears in the penning of this Epiſtle, that it was a collection of the ſtrength of more Learned Writers, and a conjunction of abler heads than his own, who were reſolved in this occaſion and inſtance, to repreſent what could in brieſe be ſaid to perſwade unſetled perſons to change their Religion; and (whatever other mens opinions are) what a reverend eſteem the Author hath of it, who tels us *he ſaw reaſon enough to believe it could not be Anſwered*, pag. 88. and that he challengeth it as a piece of juſtice to ſhew him his errors; I thought it not amiſſe to take ſome notice of it, knowing that if what I ſhould ſay were unſucceſſefull to him, yet it would not be unacceptable to God, (ſince *we are a ſweet ſavour of God in them that believe, and in them that periſh*) and that if I were not an inſtrument of Gods mercy to him, in reducing him to the truth from which he hath revolted, yet I ſhould be an inſtrument of Gods Juſtice, and a witneſs on Gods behalf to leave him without excuſe.

In one thing I muſt crave Mr *Everards* pardon, if I do not take his Councel in Anſwering him κατὰ πόδας and ſetting down each of his Paragraphs before the ſeveral Anſwers: It is a courſe which, I confeſſe, I do not approve of in the anſwering of other Authors, becauſe it runs a man into perſonall conteſts, and petite animad-

verſions,

versions and catching at little advantages, and so expends the Answerers paines, and the Readers patience, and the buyers money to no purpose: And if I did like it in some others, yet really he must excuse me if I do not esteem him so classical an Author, nor his Epistle so weighty a Discourse as to deserve such solemn consideration. Yet this I shall promise him (and I call God to witnesse it) that I shall not wilfully decline any part of it, wherein his strength may lie, but shall endeavour to the utmost of my poor skill to single out such things as are most plausible and considerable, and such, as if they be solidly Answered, the rest will fall of course, or need no further trouble.

What I have to say I shall reduce to two heads. 1. Personal. 2. Dogmatical. The first I shall passe over in few words, because it concernes not the merit of the Cause, and yet it is not convenient wholly to neglect it, because it is set forth ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου, and Mr. *Everard* (whom I should by no meanes deprive of his due praise) hath shewed wit and art in it; something therefore must be said to disabuse such as are too apt to be deceived with good words and fair speeches, and the influence of Examples. And if there be some seeming harshnesse in my expressions, it must not be ascribed to my Temper, (which my Friends will assoyle me from) or principles, or hatred of Mr. *Everard*, (a person known to me *nec beneficio, nec injuria*) but to the discharge of my Duty (which is to rebuke such as he is ἀποτόμως sharply) and the necessary caution of others. My personal Reflections shall onely be two: The first upon the quality of the person: The second, the occasion and manner of the Change.

1. As for the quality of the person, I must confess I am not at all surprized with the Apostacy (for so I must call it with S. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. and 2 *Thes.* 2. 3.) of a per-

ſon of his Character, as we have it drawn by his own pen: *pag.4. When I profeſt my ſelf againſt Infant-Baptiſme, I had run through almoſt (if not altogether) all the ſeveral Profeſſions of Chriſtianity then appearing in this Kingdome.* It is no new thing that a giddy-headed man ſhould get a fall. It is no more than was long ſince foretold, & at this day in this perſon thoſe Scriptures are fulfilled which tell us, that the *unlearned and unſtable ſhould wreſt the Scripture* (as this Epiſtler moſt horribly doth) *to their own deſtruction*, 2 Pet.3.16. That ſuch *as received not the Truth in the love of it, ſhould be given up to ſtrong deluſions to believe lies*, 2 Theſ.2.10,11. That ſuch as were *ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth* ſhould be *led away*, 2 Tim. 3.6,7. that *evill men and ſeducers* (as he now acknowledgeth he was) ſhould *wax worſe and worſe, deceiving and being deceived*, verſ.13. that *unſtable ſouls ſhould be beguiled*, 2 Pet.13.

It at is not all ſtrange, that he that deſpiſed the perſons, vilified the Function, contemned and forſook the guidance of able and faithful Proteſtant Miniſters, by whom he might have been eaſily antidoted againſt this Infection, ſhould be betrayed into the hands of Romiſh Prieſts. It is not ſtrange that he that loved to wander ſhould *antiquum obtinere*, and having paſſed thorough all the varieties which *England* affords, ſhould gratifie his temper, and follow his inclinations to ſee what newes at *Rome*. In the mean time it concerns all Proteſtants, and eſpecially perſons of the ſame complexion and condition, with fear and reverence to behold the juſt and tremendous judgment of God upon unſetled & unſtable Chriſtians, and ſuch as are given to change; whilſt they ſee theſe ſmaller rivulets of leſſer errors leading to the dead ſea of damnable deluſions. And as we have many woeful inſtances of poor deluded ſouls, that having wandred from party to party, from opinion to opinion,

from

from congregation to congregation, have at last been swallowed up, some in the gulph of downright Atheism, others of the besotting dotages of the Quakers; so we have here an instance of one, whom the same wildness and wantonness of opinion hath betrayed to Popish impostures.

The second personal reflection concernes the occasion and manner of his change, which in brief is this, as himself represents it *pag.* 5, 6. *&c.* He falls into the company and acquaintance of a Lay-papist (which he had been alwaies told, and so supposed that they were an ignorant Generation) and he proposeth and presseth an Argument, which the Captain could not answer, and therefore submits and borrowes two or three Popish Books from that Gentleman; (*viz. the Question of Questions, Fiat Lux*, and *Knots* answer to *Chillingworth* and so the work is done, my Captaine is conquered, and become a Papist, or (*stylo novo*) a Roman Catholick. Upon this relation I shall take the boldness to make these following Animadversions.

1. In general, it is very observable how easily he gives up the cause: How valiantly the Captaine fought in the field I know not, but sure I am, if he fought at the same rate that here he disputes, no man could desire an easier Adversarie. Happily because he was about to commence into a beliefe of the unbloudy sacrifice of the Masse, he was resolved his Antagonist should not have a bloudy victory. I shall adventure to commend this pattern as an effectual receipt to make Papists, and (that you may see it is a πολυχρηστὸν if not a πανφάρμακον) it will indifferently serve to make Turks, Jewes, Pagans, or Hereticks of any kind. Let a person unlearned or unstudied in the point he debates (such as none that read this relation will deny this Author to have been, unlesse they be such themselves) enter the Lists with some able

son of his Character, as we have it drawn by his own pen: *pag.4. When I profest my self against Infant-Baptisme, I had run through almost (if not altogether) all the several Professions of Christianity then appearing in this Kingdome.* It is no new thing that a giddy-headed man should get a fall. It is no more than was long since foretold, & at this day in this person those Scriptures are fulfilled which tell us, that the *unlearned and unstable should wrest the Scripture* (as this Epistler most horribly doth) *to their own destruction*, 2 Pet.3.16. That such *as received not the Truth in the love of it, should be given up to strong delusions to believe lies*, 2 Thes.2.10,11. That such as were *ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth* should be *led away*, 2 Tim.3.6,7. that *evill men and seducers* (as he now acknowledgeth he was) should *wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived*, vers.13. that *unstable souls should be beguiled*, 2 Pet.13.

It at is not all strange, that he that despised the persons, vilified the Function, contemned and forsook the guidance of able and faithful Protestant Ministers, by whom he might have been easily antidoted against this Infection, should be betrayed into the hands of Romish Priests. It is not strange that he that loved to wander should *antiquum obtinere*, and having passed thorough all the varieties which *England* affords, should gratifie his temper, and follow his inclinations to see what newes at *Rome*. In the mean time it concerns all Protestants, and especially persons of the same complexion and condition, with fear and reverence to behold the just and tremendous judgment of God upon unsetled & unstable Christians, and such as are given to change, whilst they see these smaller rivulets of lesser errors leading to the dead sea of damnable delusions. And as we have many woeful instances of poor deluded souls, that having wandred from party to party, from opinion to opinion,

from

from congregation to congregation, have at last been swallowed up, some in the gulph of downright Atheism, others of the besotting dotages of the Quakers; so we have here an instance of one, whom the same wildness and wantonness of opinion hath betrayed to Popish impostures.

The second personal reflection concernes the occasion and manner of his change, which in brief is this, as himself represents it *pag.* 5, 6. *&c.* He falls into the company and acquaintance of a Lay-papist (which he had been alwaies told, and so supposed that they were an ignorant Generation) and he proposeth and presseth an Argument, which the Captain could not answer, and therefore submits and borrowes two or three Popish Books from that Gentleman; (*viz. the Question of Questions, Fiat Lux*, and *Knots* answer to *Chillingworth* and so the work is done, my Captaine is conquered, and become a Papist, or (*stylo novo*) a Roman Catholick. Upon this relation I shall take the boldness to make these following Animadversions.

1. In general, it is very observable how easily he gives up the cause: How valiantly the Captaine fought in the field I know not, but sure I am, if he fought at the same rate that here he disputes, no man could desire an easier Adversarie. Happily because he was about to commence into a beliefe of the unbloudy sacrifice of the Masse, he was resolved his Antagonist should not have a bloudy victory. I shall adventure to commend this pattern as an effectual receipt to make Papists, and (that you may see it is a πολυχρηστὸν if not a παντάρμακον) it will indifferently serve to make Turks, Jewes, Pagans, or Hereticks of any kind. Let a person unlearned or unstudied in the point he debates (such as none that read this relation will deny this Author to have been, unlesse they be such themselves) enter the Lists with some able

Champion of the adverse party (a Character which the Captaine himselfe ascribes to his then Antagonist, and when he meets with an Objection that himself cannot answer, let him conclude it unswerable (which our Author did) and read two or three such Books as his Adversary shall put into his hand, if this do not speedily and effectually work the cure, he may be given over for desperate.

2. Though to determine that this suppposed conversion was a plotted businesse, may seem an intrusion into the Divine prerogative to judge the heart, yet this I may safely say, that it, looks so like a plot, that it requires more than an ordinary charity to believe it was not. For as the Philosopher well observes, no man must (and no serious man will) forsake a solid and well grounded Truth, for some subtil objection suggested by a crafty disputer, which he cannot answer. If it was not a designed thing, how can it be imagined, that in a matter of Salvation and damnation, he should be so grossely negligent in the use of meanes to come to the knowledge of the Truth and the answering of his Objection? Otherwise who can believe that he would not have addressed himself to some able Protestant Minister or Scholar to see whether he could Answer it, (unlesse peradventure, through the pride of his heart he scorned the advice of Ministers, and thought himself wiser than his Teachers, and then no wonder such pride had a fall,) or would he not by the direction of some knowing Protestants have rather searched into some Protestant books for an Answer, (as here he falls upon the reading of Popish Authors by the advice of a Papist) if he really were a Protestant at that time when he pretended to be so; for if this Captaine had understood those controversies, and spent that time in the reading of the solid Books of excellent protestant Authors, and grounding himself in the principles of Re-

B

gion, which he spent in talking and teaching others, and and scribling of idle Pamphlets, and railing at Learned and Godlie Ministers; these objections, which through his ignorance and unacquaintednesse with those points seemed new to him, would have been discovered to him as they are to others, to be but Coleworts not twice but twenty times sod, and Arguments long since exploded.

3. To this let me adde, the wonder is the greater, and the Design more credible, to consider that his conversion should be wrought by such Authors, as *Fiat Lux*, and *Knots* Answer to *Chillingworth*: The former nothing but an heap of words, and an empty sound, which if stript of all its gauderies, and Rhetorical flashes, (apt to take none but children in understanding) and all the weight of Reasons were pickt out, and brought together, it might (without such Art as was shewed about *Homer*) be put into a Nut-shell, unlesse happily that was the Aagument that convinc'd him, that the Author tels us (*us*, I say, who are English men, and remember the *Marian* Persecution, & the *Irish* Massacre, and the bloodinesse of the *French* Leaguers, and the Barbarities of High & Low *Germany*, and the late Ferities of *Piedmont*) that the Pope is a very honest Gentleman, that never did any harme.

And for *Knot's infidelity unmasked*, that man that shall take that Book for a solid confutation of Mr *Chillingworth*, must have lost both Reason and Conscience, (for the losse of one of them will hardly serve turn:) by which you may see the Captain was prepared for a Change, and like soft wax ready to receive the impression. And this is all I shall say concerning the quality of the person, and the manner of his Change: I shall now come to the Dogmaticall part.

The first and principal thing will be to consider the force of that Discourse which did the work, which though it be a very silly one, yet it is commensurate to many mens capacities, and meeting with an ignorant proud or loose Protestant, sometimes is the mean of their perversion.

The Popish Gentleman asked me (saith my Author) *whether I was so certainly and infallibly assured of the Truth of the Christian Religion, that it was not possible for me, or for those who taught me Christianity, to be mistaken therein; and he gave me this Reason for his Question, that otherwise, as to me, Christianity could be no more than probably true; and we could not condemne the Jew, or Turke, or Pagan, since they were as well perswaded of their several wayes, as we could be of ours, upon a fallible certainty, and for ought we knew, (not having any infallible certainty for our Christianity) some of them might be in the right, and we in the wrong way, for it is possible you may be mistaken, pag. 5, 6.*

This is that, that did the deed, and this is the shield of *Hercules*, or rather the sword of *Goliah*, by which they sometimes do execution upon an ungrounded or ungodly Protestant, which therefore it will be worth while a little to insist upon.

1. Let it be observed, what rare Champions the Papists are for the Christian cause, and what a singular course they take for the Conversion of Jewes, and Turks, and Pagans. For more clearnesse I shall represent it in a Syllogistical Form: If the Church of *Rome* (*i. e.* the Pope and a Councel) be not infallible, a Jew, or Turke, or Pagan are as well perswaded of their several waies, as we of ours, (these are the Authors words:) But the Church of *Rome* (whether you mean the Pope or Councel or both) is not infallible. This I hope hath been made evident enough from the foregoing Discourse, *Ergo*, a

Jew

Jew, or Turk, or Pagan are as well perſwaded of their ſeveral wayes, as we of ours. A glorious Concluſion! and moſt true of *Italian* Chriſtians; Turks and Pagans are as well perſwaded of their wayes, as they are of Chriſtianity. Nor is it without cauſe that ſo many Authors (ſome of them Popiſh) complain ſo much of the ſwarmes of Atheiſts in the Church of *Rome*; for certainly this is as compendious a way to Atheiſm as can likely be imagined, to hang the verity of Chriſtianity and the Popes or Councels infallibility upon the ſame pin; and conſequently thoſe learned Papiſts, who doubtleſſe many of them laugh in their ſleeves, to ſee ſo credulous and ſimple a world to believe the latter, can eaſily ſhake off the ſence of the former.

2, Let us examine a little the ſtrength of this pretty Propoſition: That if we be not infallibly aſſured of the truth of Chriſtianity, Jewes, and Turks, and Pagans are as well perſwaded of their wayes as we of ours. What a mad aſſertion is this, that nothing is credible, but what is infallibly certain, and that there is no difference between probabilities and improbabilities, and yet ſuch Whirl pools and quick-ſands muſt they needs ſink into, that give up themſelves to the conduct of Popiſh guides and principles. I am not infallibly certain that there is ſuch a place as *Jamaica*, (for it is poſſible all Geographers may miſtake, and all Travellers may lye, unleſſe his Holineſſe ſhould chance to make a voiage to ſee:) therefore by this doughty argument, I am as certain, that there is a Sea-paſſage to *China* by the North. I am not infallibly ſure, that the Sun is bigger than a Buſhel, (for *Epicurus* thought it no bigger, as *Cicero* informes us:) therefore (it ſeemes) I am as certain that there is a world in the Moon, or in every Starre (as ſome Philoſophers held) I am not infallibly certain of the exiſtence and atchievement of *Alexander* the

Great; by this argument it will follow, that I am no leſſe ſure of the Hiſtory and adventures of S. *George* of *England*. What if I be not infallibly ſure of the truth of the Chriſtian Religion, may there not be ſuch clear probabilities, and cogent evidence, that none but a mad-man can deny it? What if in a froſty morning I ſhould find 2 or three verſes written upon a glaſſe window, will any man in his right wits doubt, that ſome man or other writ them? and yet it is not impoſſible (becauſe it implies no contradiction) that the Froſt (which oft times carves out various and curious figures) ſhould ſome time or other have a lucky hit, and fall into a vein of Poetry. Or what if I ſee a Calf in a field, will any ſober man queſtion whether it came from a Cow, becauſe I am not infallibly certain it did not drop out of the Clouds, as once one did? In like manner, if I be not ſimply infallible (taking the word in a ſtrict and proper notion) of the Truth of Chriſtian Religion, yet certainly it may ſuffice againſt any Turk, or Jew, or Pagan, or Papiſt either, who in this argument, as in many other things, are confederate with them, whoſe reaſon makes him a perſon fit for Diſcourſe, that there are ſo great and many & pregnant evidences, that no man can deny without forfeiture of his reaſon, diſcretion, and modeſty, and all the principles of humanity.

3. If this argument be cogent, and beſides the *certitudo objecti*, the infallibility of the thing, there be required a *certitudo ſubjecti*, the infallibility of the perſon, to be ſatisfied, (which here is contended for,) then not onely the Pope and Councel, but every particular Chriſtian muſt have this gift of infallibility, (an ampliation of the priviledge which his great Ghoſtly Father will never allow,) for mark it, that is the thing which the Catholick Gentleman urged, and wherewith my Captain was gravelled: *He asked me* (ſaith he) *whether I was ſure and certain*

tian, — and whether I was so certainly and infallibly assured of the truth of Christian Religion, or else (said he) *as to me Christianity was but probably true, else it is possible you may be mistaken:* and at this rate do they use to talke to such as they desire to Proselyte. By all which it appears, that the Infallibility must be particular in every individual person, that would be satisfied himself, or would convince another of the Truth of Christianity. *I* am not ignorant of a shuffling artifice, which this Catholick used in confounding two things together, necessary to be distinguished, as no wonder to meet with confusion of language in the builders of *Babel*) whilst he (too cunning for twenty of these Novices) states the businesse thus: *He asked me* (saith my Author) *whether I was so certain, — that it was not possible for me, or for those who taught me Christianity, to be mistaken in this,* p. 5. Here lies the mystery of Iniquity, and here was the blind cast before the eyes of this unequal combatant, which he had neither wit enough to understand himself, nor humility enough to learn from others. But I shall endeavour to bring this Fox out of his hole by this Argument: Either a subjective certainty or infallibility of belief of the Truth of Christianity is necessary for particular Christians, or it is not: if it be not necessary, then in vain do Papists urge this argument, and boast so much of it, as unanswerable, whereas now they give it up, and confesse probable evidence sufficient for particular Christians, and Infallibility necessary only for the Pope or Councel: and so the poor Captain hath lost his Infallibility, and had best think of his old military word, *As you were*, for here the cord is cut asunder, by which he was drawn over to *Rome*, for now the Protestant stands upon even ground (at least) with the Papist. For suppose, for once, contradictions were reconciled, and the Popish opinion of the Churches infallible authority were true in it self *certitudine objecti*,

so

So also is the Protestants opinion concerning the Infallible authority of the Scripture true in it self, and *certitudine objecti*, as the most desperate Papists do grant, *Stapleton*, and *Bellarmine*, and all. *The Scripture* (say they) *is Divine, and true, and certain in it self, but not* quoad nos: therefore hitherto there is no difference: now to proceed. If it be a sufficient foundation for a Romanist, that he hath such probable evidence of this doctrine of the Churches Infallibility, why should it not be as sufficient a foundation for a Protestant, that he hath such (nay infinitely more) probable evidence of the doctrine of the Scriptures infallibility? since the evidence of the latter is granted by the Papists themselves, and the evidence of the former not onely denyed and disputed down by the Protestants, but also questioned by their own Authors, as I have shewed at large. This question I challenge the whole club of Jesuites, (which happily contributed to this Epistle) solidly to answer. But now on the other side, if they will retire to the other part of the Dilemma, and say, That a subjective infallibility is necessary for particular Christians, then every Papist in *England* not onely hath a Pope in his Belly, but hath got his Crown also upon his head, and communicates with him in that great Prerogative of Infallibility: and truly I must do them justice, without doubt every Papist in *England* is as infallible as the Pope himself.

4. But if nothing will satisfie but infallibility, let us a little enquire into it, what it is, and where it lies, and what infallible and irresistible demonstrations the Romanists have for this grand principle, for which a man must put out the eyes of his reason, & forsake the conduct of the Scripture, & depose the Holy Spirit from his Royalty. Certainly it is madness in the highest to put us off with conjectures, and suppositions, and imagined probabilities in so important an affair, upon which all the rest depends,

and

and to which all muſt ſtrike ſaile: ſo then, the queſtion will be this, whether this pretence of infallibility be not a *gratis dictum*, a crude and bold aſſertion, or rather, whether it be evidenced with ſuch ſtrength and clearneſſe, as to compel the aſſent of all reaſonable perſons: And here I ſhall do the Captaine and the Popiſh cauſe this right, as to conſider it in its moſt advantageous notion. If there be any infallibility, moſt certain it is, that it is in the Pope and general Councel together, which is the moſt plauſible and received opinion of the Church of *Rome*. And here it is that our Engliſh Apoſtate, Mr *Creſſy*, in the laſt Edition of his Book, centers; and here alſo the Captain caſts anchor: *The Prelates of the Church* (ſaith he) *though as men they are fallible, yet when aſſembled in a general Councel with their ſupreme Paſtor, they are ſtill made infallible by the aſſiſtance of the ſame holy Ghoſt, who was as well promiſed to them as to the Apoſtles.*

Now for this notion, I might refer the Captain and the Reader to what I have ſaid and proved in the foregoing Treatiſe, which when he, or any of his Fathers ſhall ſolidly anſwer, it will be time enough then to conſider it. But becauſe this is the ſole foundation upon which the Papiſts build all the reſt, and Mr *Creſſy* adjures all Proteſtants, that omitting or deferring all particular diſputes with Catholicks, they would examine this point, *Sect.* 2. *Chap.* 19. and becauſe I am reſolved by God's help to ſearch and try where the ſtrength of this *Sampſon* lies, (if there be any in it) I ſhall a little farther conſider it; and if I find his arguments proportionable to his confidence, and that he is as ſolid in proving it, as he is daring in aſſerting it, ſurely he will do the Chriſtian world an inexpreſſible favour, and infinitely oblige all Proteſtants, and he will find us far from the madneſſe of fighting againſt God and our own ſoules. But ſince all is not Gold

that

that glisters, and our Savonr hath commanded us to try the Spirits, and to prove all things, and not to believe men, saying, *Lo here is Christ*, or *Lo there is Christ*; they must not take it amisse, if, after such evident discovery of their manifold impostures, we dare not take all things upon trust from them, nor swallow down so great a morsel without chewing, and enquiring into it.

It seems to be granted on both sides, and the nature of the thing requires it, That this being a grand principle should have the greatest evidence, which things of that nature can bear: and such indeed they pretend for it. So Mr *Cressy* tells us, That *as this controversy was of infinite importance, Providence hath suitably furnished us with means of satisfaction —infinitely more copious, evident, and powerful, than in any other besides, Exomolog sect.2 chap.18.* And Again: *That which I undertake to make evident to J.P. is, that the Church speaking by a general Councel, confirmed by the Pope, is an infallible guide, (and that with more evidence than he can produce for the Scripture it self.)* Appendix to his *Exomologesis chap.4. num.9.* It is well that saying and doing are two things, or else the Protestant cause had been quite in the dust. If Mr *Cressy* make this good, his work is done; if not, it will concern him to remember from whence he is fallen, and repent of his Apostacy. So now we are come to the point, whether the Churches Infallibility be so evidently proved, as they pretend? They affirm, and I deny it: and the grounds of my denial have been a principal part of the foregoing discourse, I shall forbear repetitions, as much as is possible, and shall here onely give two Arguments to shew, That this pretended evidence of the doctrine of Infallibility is but one their μηγαλορρήματα, and a piece of their usual artifice, to give us confident affirmations instead of evident proofs.

My first reason is taken from the inevidence of this doctrine

doctrine to themselves, and many of their own Brethren What a desperate assertion is it, to ascribe greater evidence to the Churches infallibility, (which is denied by many of their own Authors,) than to the Divinity of the Scripture? whose evidence is so great, that both Protestants and Papists universally acquiesce in it.) I have already represented the differences and dissatisfactions of their own Authors in this, supposed to be, most evident point. And ceriainly, it can be nothing but want of evidence, which hinders the assent of those, whose interest so powerfully obligeth them to it. Particularly I have shewed the vanity of that pretence of agreement between their divided Authors in the Infallibility of the Pope and a Councel together, and that the several Partisans, howsoever they put them both together in name and shew, yet in truth they ascribe the Infallibility entirely to the one or other, either to the Pope alone, or to the Councel alone, and to the other onely in dependance thereupon. *Infallibility is not partly in the Pope, and partly in the Councel, but wholly in the Pope* (say the Jesuites,) *and from him communicated to the Councel, who are infallible no farther than they have his consent and concurrence.* And on the other side, *it is wholly in the Councel, and in the Pope onely by participation from them,* (say the Gallican Papists, and Anti-Jesuitical party, and of this mind were those Councels that undertook the censuring and removeing of Popes themselves.) And consequently, the Infallibility of Councels not being evident to the Jesuites and their party, and the Infallibility of the Pope not being evident to the French Papists, and many others, it followes, that there is no evidence at all in either, nor in both together, their own Authors being Judges. For if I can prove to a Jesuite, That the Pope *in Cathedrâ* is not infallible, he will (& by his principles must) grant, That the addition of a Councel doth not

make

make him infallible. And if I can prove to a French Papist, that a general Councel rightly called and constituted is not infallible, he will (and by his principles must) acknowledge the Popes consent cannot render them infallible: so that indeed if either be disproved, both are disproved.

Nor doth any thing render this evidence more darke, and the Romish cause more contemptible, than the consideration of those poor Fig-leaves, wherewith Mr *Cressy* seeks to cover his Mothers nakednesse in this particular. For when Mr *Chillingworth* urged this very argument against their infallible Judge, that themselves were divided about it, who it was, whether Pope or Councel *&c.* all that Mr *Cressy* answers *ad rem*, is this; That these different Authors of theirs are all agreed in that decision of the Councel of *Trent*, *It belongs to the Church to be Judg of the true sense of the Holy Scripture*: an answer so desperate, that it shewes that man, who could acquiesce in it, to be, if not a Papist by interest rather than Conscience, yet at least one given up by God to those *strong delusions*, threatned to the Followers of Antichrist, 2 *Thes.* 2. among whom he hath now listed himself. And doth this indeed end the differences? doth he offer that for an Answer, which his Adversary before had acknowledged? and is this all the relief they have towards the ending of all differences, and the satisfaction of their consciences? When *Alexander* was asked to whom he would leave his Empire? and he answered, To the best: since he did not at all determine, who this *best* was, I think no man in his wits will say, this was a likely or effectual way to end the differences among the Grecians. It is true the Captains were all agreed *in genere*, that it should be left to the best; but some thought one best, others another, and so the dissensions continued among them, and were not at all healed by that general agreement. In the very same manner

manner, although they be agreed in the generall, that the Church must judge, so long as they continue at variance, and have implacable feuds about it who this Church is, they are not one whit nearer agreement. Suppose in former times a question arose between the Senate and Emperor of Rome, which was the chief power, and supreme Judge of all Civill controversies, and the Subjects of the Empire were highly divided about it, some ascribing the supremacy to the Emperor, others to the Senate: would Mr *Cressy* say, the Romans are agreed, because they were all united in this, That the supreme power was to end all their controversies? Suppose 3 or 4 Competitors to a Kingdome, and the inhabitants thereof severally divided about them; will any man on this side Bedlam say, they are all agreed, because agreed in this generall, that the King must rule? or must not every man acknowledg that this agreement signifies but little, so long as they differ about this, which is that King? And is not this the very case of the Church of *Rome*? They are all agreed (forsooth,) not one dissenting voice among them: but how? why they are agreed that the Church is the judge. But Mr *Cressy*, the great difference is behind, who is the Church? the Pope, say some, a Councel say others, a Pope and Councel together say a third sort, (and the several assertors of each opinion confute and destroy the rest,) and *all that hold any of these opinions are universally esteemed good Catholicks*, saith Mr *Cressy* in his Append. *ch* 4. *num*. 7. So they are good Catholicks that dispute down the Pope's Infallibility, & they good Catholicks too that dispute down the infallibility of Councels, and (for the reason before mentioned) they good Catholicks, that reject the Infallibility of both together. And therefore 'tis a most impudent position, which Mr *Cressy* layes down, (and the Papists are obliged to own,) *That the doctrine of the Churches infallibility is so evident, that*

that the Protestants are inexcusable, and αὐτοκατάκριτοι, that do not receive it: out of thy mouth will God judge thee, O thou unfaithfull Servant, who hast thus expressed thy self in another place; *To my understanding there is some inhumanity in urging Protestants to more than Catholicks will be obliged to, or to think that to Protestants prepossessed with passion and partiality, that can be made evident, which is so far from being evident to some Catholicks, that they renounce it. Appendix* to the *Exomologesis*, ch. 4. num. 7.

To this might be added, as a farther demonstration of the inevidence of this point even to the Romanists themselves, those secret checks which they meet with from their own consciences in the assertion of this supposed Infallibility, discovered by their haltings, and corrections, and tergiversations, and self contradictions in explication of this new phænomenon. For however Mr *Cressy* mounts this Infallibility so high, that it must not yield to Scripture it self, yet both himself elsewhere, and their other Authors every where are contented with a far lower proportion. *Bellarmine* (whom Mr *Cressy* recites and approves) in his comparison of the Infallibility of the Church and Scripture, gives the prebeminence to Scripture in five several respects. See *Cressy Sect.* 2. *ch.* 21. *Truth, and our obligation to believe it, is in an higher degree in Scripture, than in the decisions of the Church. Cressy Appendix chap.* 5. *n.* 2. And this Infallibility of the Church, though they will not suffer us to call it humane and moral, yet they dare not assert it to be Divine, but onely after a sort, and in some manner Divine, as the Author of *Laud's Labyrinth* informes us. And this Infallibility they farther confesse is not in way of immediate revelation or inspiration from God, but in the way of argumentation and discourse. And here too they are wonderfull cautious: for it is acknowledged by *Bellarmine* & *Stapleton*

Stapleton, and subscribed by Mr. *Cressy*, *That the Church is fallible in the premises, but infallible in the conclusion. Cressy, ubi supra*, and *sect. 2. chap. 32.* and *Append. chap. 5. In the decisions of the Church, the simple conclusion decided is onely accounted infallibly true, not so the principles upon which it depends, or reasons by which it is proved.* Really these Romish Priests are admirable Fellowes in all things: Admirable Builders! *Vitruvius* himself might learn Architecture from them, for they can teach him how to build a solid and durable Edifice upon a rotten foundation: Admirable Logicians! *Aristotle* might go to School to them, and learn such Lessons as were above his apprehension; for it is resolved he must blot out his Axiomes, *Conclusio sequitur partem debiliorem*, and, *Non debet esse plus in conclusione quàm in præmissis*, and, *Ex falsis nil nisi falsum*: The Colledge of Jesuites at *Rome* are ready to make good the contrary against him, when *Plato's* great year shall bring him and them together upon the Stage. Admirable Divines! that have out-done their Lord and Master, and in spight of whatsoever is said by him, *Luke* 6.43, 44 will, if he please, maintain a dispute with him upon this *Thesis*, *That a corrupt tree can bring forth good fruit, and that of thornes men may gather Figs, and of a Bramblebush grapes*: and this shall be not probably defended, but infallibly demonstrated. For it were a silly thing to think, that they that are infallible Divines should be but fallible Disputants. But to return: The inevidence of this notion of the Churches Infallibility may sufficiently appear from Mr *Cressy's* own expressions (which have been observed by others)! who by the evidence of the Truth was forced to this acknowledgment, That *Infallibility is an infortunate word*, that Mr. Chillingworth *hath combated it with too great success, so that I could wish* (saith he) *the word were forgotten, or at least laid by*, whereas all that understand any thing, know, that it

was not the word, but the thing which he combated; and his arguments were not nominal against the Title, but real against the thing it self. It is true, since this passage was published and taken notice of, Mr *Cressy* (having doubtlesse been severely school'd by his Superiours for such a dangerous passage) is grown more cautious, and hath stretched his wit (and I fear his conscience too) to palliate his assertion, and make an honourable retreat: and he honestly acquaints us with his design, *i.e.* being *crafty to catch the Protestants with guile*, Sect. 2. ch. 21. He that reads the appendix to the second Edition of his *Exomologesis*, will easily discern the trepidations of a guilty conscience, whilst sometimes you shall find him tacitly denying the Churches infallibility properly so called, and contenting himself with great probability in the room of it. At other times you will meet him crying up this infallibility in expresse or equivalent terms, and in most places having no *salvo* for himself but this; that his assertion, and the Protestants disputation did proceed upon the mistaken notion of infallibility, which the Protestants advanced to an higher pitch than ever the Church of *Rome* did, and so fought against an image that themselves had set up: which is so notorious a falsehood, that if Mr. *Cressy*'s wit, and memory, and conscience had not all failed him together, he could hardly have run into it, since all Protestants of any note ever did, and particularly Mr *Chillingworth* doth dispute against the Churches infallibility, onely in that sense and degree which Mr *Cressy* upon maturest advice in this second Edition hath thought fit to expresse in these words, That *God will preserve his Church in all truth, so as to secure all believers, that she can neither deceive them, nor be deceived her self.* Sect. 2. Chap. 21. Did ever any Protestant, that understood himself, or the point pretend to more? Not Mr *Chillingworth* I am sure: They all knew and granted, that absolute infallibi-

lity

lity was God's prerogative, and neither pretended by the Church of *Rome*, nor was that opinion by protestants fastned upon them: The onely question was, whether God did vouchsafe such infallible guidance to the Church, that she could not erre in her decrees, and decisions; This Papists affirmed, and Protestants denied: and let me adde, that this Infallibility is as high as was ever ascribed to the Prophets or Apostles and Penmen of the Holy Scripture. And although their Infallibility be said to be large or greater *extensivè*, because in them it reacheth to all sentences, and words, and Arguments, yet the Romanists themselves cannot say it is higher or greater *intensivè*, and the Articles of Faith or conclusive decisions decreed by Councels, are in their opinion as infallible, as the same are when they are laid down in the Scripture. This was the Notion Mr *Chillingworth* combated against, with so great successe as *Cressy* confesseth.

The second Argument to prove the inevidence of this notion of the Churches infallibility, I shall take from the impertinency and feebleness of those crutches or reasons wherewith they indeavour to support it. I observe the summe and strength of what he hath to say in this point is reducible to five heads.

The first and great pretence is this, *Take away infallibility and you destroy all Authority; all Authority, that is not infallible, is meer Faction and Rebellion, and Authority that reacheth onely to the outward appearance, or the purse.* Cressy *Appen. ch. 7. num. 2.* And elsewhere, infallibility and Authority are in effect all one as applied to the Church, *Ibid. c. 5. n 14.* And the assertions of the Churches Authority which are frequent in the Fathers, Mr. *Cressy* urgeth as if they had been directly levelled at the Churches infallibility, *Exomolog. Sect. 2. chap. 19.* Nay so daring is this man in his Argument, that not contented with his

own pretended satisfaction in it, he will needs obtrude the same opinion upon that Noble Lord *Falkland* (which it is sufficiently known he abhorred) *viz.* that *if the Catholick Churches Authority and infallibility were opposed, all other Churches must expire: The Authority of the English Church would be an aery phantasme*, &c. *Append. chap. 6. num. 19.*

For Answer, I durst appeale to the conscience of this very man, but that Apostates in the Faith do at the same time make shipwrack of a good conscience, let any Romanist, that is not prodigal of his Damnation, seriously consider the grosse falshood of this bold supposition. What, no Authority without infallibility? Belike there is no Authority in the King, because no Infallibility. He will say, Civil Authority is but external; But Ecclesiastical reacheth the conscience, and commands the belief of the inward man: Mr *Cressy* knew this to be a *gratis dictum*, and justly denied by Protestants, and therefore he should have proved it, but crude suppositions and imperious Dictates do passe among Romanists for solid Demonstrations. Yet again I would aske Mr *Cressy*, whether the Assembly of the Clergy in *France* have Authority over that Church or no: if he deny it, I refer him to his Brethren there for an Answer: If he grant it, then Authority may be without infallibility. Again, I ask him whether the Pope without a Councel have Authority over the Church or no: if he deny it, tis at his peril; if he affirme it, then his argument is in great jeopardy: For Protestants are allowed to disbelieve the Popes personal infallibility; And he confesseth (I gave you his own words before) that good Catholicks deny it and dispute against it. Yet once more: When general Councels have been called to determine the pretensions of Anti-popes, or to depose usurping Popes, or when they have had differences with the Popes

I demand whether these Councels had any Authority or no? To say they had none, or that their Authority was but an *airy phantasm*, I think Mr *Cressy* will not dare; and if they had, then either a Councel without the Pope is infallible (which most learned Papists now deny, and if Mr *Cressy* be of another mind, let him tell us,) or Authority may be without infallibility.

In a word, that the world may see the complexion of an Apostate's Conscience, This very man will grant, that ther is an Authority in the Superiour over his Coevent, in every Bishop over his Diocesse, in every General over his order, and a weighty Authority too (as their vassals feel by sad experience) yet I hope these are not infallible, *E.* the more impudent is he that argues from Authority to infallibility.

A second Argument is much of the same complexion, taken from the style and practice of general Councels which was to propose their Doctrines as infallible Truths, and to command all Christians under the pain of Anathema, and eternal damnation to believe them for such, *That Authority which should speak thus not being infallible, would be guilty of the greatest tyranny and cruelty, and usurpation that ever was in the World.* Append. chap. 4. n. 9.

This hath been fully answered before, and therefore I shall here content my self with these two reflections.

1. The utmost of this Argument (abstracting from the invidious expressions he here clothes it with, that it may have in terrour what it wants in strength) would be no more than this, That general Councels in such a way of proceeding were mistaken, and were liable to error: a proposition, which he knew very well the Protestants did universally own, and I hope well may, since the Jesuites (so great a part and support of the Roman Church)

have and do acknowledge, that General Councels and their Decrees are not infallible untill the Popes consent be added, yet such Councels (as is notoriously known) have used to put their Anathema's to their decrees before the Pope's assent was given: And yet forsooth (if you will believe a man that hath cast away his Faith) this Argument is more evident than we can produce for the Scripture it self (for so he saith, *ibid.*)

2. These Anathema's do not at all prove that such Councels either were or thought themselves infallible. It is true, it is an Argument they thought one of these two things, either that the Doctrine proposed by them was infallibly true (as indeed they did) or that their Authority was infallibly certain (which they never pretended) either of these were a sufficient ground for such Anathema's; and therefore his Argument is infirme, proceeding *à genere ad speciem, animal est, E. homo.* They owned infallibility, *E.* they owned it in their Authority. Particular pastors have a power to Anathematize, and do so in case of Excommunication of Hereticks: are they therefore infallible? If it be said they do it onely in pursuance and execution of the Decrees of Councels; I answer; if such persons (confessedly fallible) may Anathematize them that renounce the Doctrines delivered in Councels, because supposed to be infallibly true, why may not the same persons Anathematize them that renounce the Doctrines expressely delivered in Scripture, which all grant to be infallibly true? Again, if we look into the Records of Councels, we shall find that this practice of Anathematizing was not onely in use in general, but also in particular and provincial Councels, which are confessed to be fallible: *E.* Mr. *Cressy* look to your Arguments and conscience better. Once more, the Pope's anathema's all the world rings of, yet you have seen his infallibility is denied by many and learned Papists, and

they

they too *such as are universally esteemed good Catholicks*, saith Mr *Cressy Append. chap. 4. num. 7.* Therefore how durst he say, Anathema's are evidences of Infallibility?

The third Argument is taken from the promises of infallibility made to this Church. *This doctrine of the Churches infallibility is the most expresse in Scriptures*, saith Mr *Cressy, Sect. 2. chap. 26. n. 5.* I suppose he told us so upon the same account that the old Painter wrot under his picture, This is a Lion, for fear some should have mistaken it for a Bull; for truly if he had not said it was most expresse there, any rational man would have sworn the contrary.

I confesse, I thought Mr *Cressy* (as well as Mr *White* & other Traditional Doctors) had been sick of those pretences, and sufficiently discovered the impertinency of them to their purpose: and really when I read over the Scriptures quoted by him to prove this infallibility, and consider how insignificant they are to his businesse, and how plainly, and fully, and frequently they have been answered by Protestants, (which he doth not here reply to) I must not dissemble, that I find a great difficulty to believe his conscience could be satisfied therewith: surel am, whilst he was a Protestant, (if he understood himself) he would have entertained such proofs with contempt. I dare confidently say, that most of the Scripture allegations produced by the Quakers (in defence of their absurd and ridiculous opinions) are every whit as pertinent as any that are here cited. It is true they are material to that purpose to which they are cited by the Fathers, *viz.* to prove the Churches perpetuity and just Authority; but for infallibility, how far the Fathers were from believing that, I hope hath been made sufficiently evident from the foregoing Discourse, where also particular Answers have been given to their Argu-

ments from these places, which when they solidly vindicate, it will deserve, and (σὺν θεῷ) shall have our condsieration. At present I shall content my self with this general animadversion.

Those Scriptural promises pretended for the Churches infallibility, either they do of themselves without the Churches sence and exposition, evidently and solidly prove the point they are brought for, or they do not; if they say they do, then other passages of Scripture (undoubtedly far more plain and positive for diverse Doctrines rejected by the Papists) do of themselves, without the Churches sense and exposition, prove those points they are brought for, and so Scripture may decide controversies, if they say not, then the Churches infallibility must be supposed, before it can be proved from those Texts, which is I confesse agreeable to the Roman Catholick way of Disputation, and fit for them that cannot endure reason should be Judge, but I am sure it will never satisfie any man that hath any care of his conscience or Salvation. But I can tell the Reader good Newes, and that which is strange too among Romanists, who use to confute Protestants by the meer naming of those Texts, that have been substantially vindicated an hundred times, Mr *Cressy* hath one Chapter entitled the *Validity of such Texts* &c. so it is called, but I doubt it was the Printers mistake for *Invalidity*, as will appear upon perusal. He offers but one Argument for proofe of this Capital Assertion, upon which all the Papacy depends, and it is this: *The Antient Fathers do usually argue against their Hereticks and Schismaticks from those promises, that Christs Church should continue for ever, and that the gates of Hell should not prevaile against her: Now* (saith he) *if these promises of Christ be not infallible and absolute, and that Church visible*, what then? then woe to the poor Fathers, *then the Writings of those Fathers*

will

will prove to be the most fooliſh, impertinent, jugling, yea blaſphemous and pernicious diſcourſes that ever were. So *Creſſy* Sect. 2. chap. 28. that is to ſay (if we take the notion out of this odious dreſſe) they uſed fallacious Arguments: Very good! And is this that, that ſatisfied Mr *Creſſy*'s conſcience? Oh the modeſty of the man! you ſee a little thing ſatisfies him; but if he will cheat himſelf, let him not think to cheat us with ſuch ridiculous Arguments.

1. The utmoſt of what would follow is that the Antient Fathers whoſe Writings are extant were Fallible, and liable to miſtakes: A Propoſition which I have formerly proved, and the Popiſh Doctors themſelves agree with us therein, I ſuppoſe Mr *Creſſy* will not diſſent.

2. If upon every impertinent and unconcluding Argument produced by Fathers, Councels, or Popes, againſt ſuppoſed Hereticks, I ſhould make this inference that they were all Juglers, Blaſphemers, *&c.* Mr *Creſſy* will now think it a very harſh cenſure: When their great Lords and Maſters argue at this rate (as he knowes who did) Ariſe *Peter* kill and eat, and here are two Swords: *Ergo* the Pope hath Civill and Spiritual power over all men: They that in the fleſh cannot pleaſe God: *E.* Prieſts ſhould not be married: God made man after his own Image: *E.* Images are lawfull. Will Mr *Creſſy* now ſay theſe were all Juglers, Blaſphemers, *&c?* and their Writings the moſt fooliſh, impertinent, pernicious Diſcourſes that ever were? either then let Mr *Creſſy* qualify his cenſure there, or apply it here.

3. If the Fathers were ſuppoſed infallible, yet they might uſe impertinent and unconcluding Arguments. You muſt remember our Maſters the Romaniſts, while they aſſert the infallibility of the Pope and Councell, they cautiouſly diſtinguiſh between the concluſion and the

the mediums or Arguments to prove it: I will onely mind you of him whom they all so highly approve and applaud, *i.e. Stapleton* (whom Mr *Cressy* followes and the rest of them) who (as you saw) limits this infallibility to the Conclusion, not to the premises or Argument; So if the Fathers were infallible (as you see & the Papists confesse they are not) yet this being onely in the Conclusion, it will not at all secure them from impertinency and error in their Arguments or mediums used to confirme the conclusions, which is all that this Discourse of Mr *Cressy* pretends to prove. So now judge, whether the Printer was not a knave (for sure the Author could not be so, since he is a *Benedictine*) to set in the front of this Argument, *The Validity*, &c.

But you know *non omnia possumus omnes*: Peradventure Mr *Cressy* is a better respondent than opponent, and though he cannot at all prove his own assertion, yet he will at least solidly Answer his Adversaries. But alas! here he is jejune, that it moves my pitty; for when Mr *Chillingworth* pleaded that these promises were onely conditional, if Christians should make use of Gods means —The Church should continue: Hereto (saith *Cressy*) the answer is very ready. Oh the benefit of a ready wit when attended with an easy Conscience! 1. *There is no warrant from any circumstance in those Texts for such a new interpretation.*.

I will not ingage in that Argument, only I will referre a parallel place to his consideration: It is said particularly concerning Jerusalem (which never was said concerning Rome) *I have hallowed this house—to put my name there in for ever, and mine eyes, and mine heart shall be there perpetually*, 1 Kings 9.3. And it is again repeated concerning that house, that *the Lord had said, In Jerusalem shall my Name be for ever*, 2 Chron. 33.4. Then (if he have a conscience) let him Answer, whether there be not

as much warrant from these Texts to prove this promise to *Jerusalem* to be infallible and unconditional, (which they grant it was not) as from the other Texts to prove them to be so to the Church of *Rome*. He need not take day to answer it.

His second answer is wholly *ad hominem*, (and the other you will say was little *ad rem*,) That Mr *Chillingworth applies this to future times onely not to past or present, and therefore it concernes not the dispute in hand about the Romane Catholick Church, which all English Protestants acknowledge to be a true Church of Christ*. Just so they would perswade their Proselytes, that all Protestants grant that theirs is a safe way, and Salvation to be had ordinarily in the communion of their Church; whereas neither the one nor the other are true. But what if Protestants do, and Mr *Chillingworth* did grant their Church to be a true Church, doth it therefore follow, these Texts were pertinently alledged to prove it? or did Mr *Chillingworth* say, these promises were absolute for time past or present, and conditional onely for the future? no such matter: but these are only his own dreams, and shufflings, who *(pro more)* when he cannot answer his Adversary, indeavours to blind his Reader: I have only one thing more to observe upon that (which he tells us Mr *Chillingworth* saw) *That if there were such promises of indefectibility, none could challenge them but the Romane Church, since she onely claims them, all others lay down their claime*. But that also is no more solid than the rest: for since this promise of indefectibility is general and indefinite, it no more belongs to *Rome* than to any other particular Church: neither have they any more interest in the promise, because they boldly claime the Monopoly of it, (since an usurpers claime gives him no just Title to the thing:) Nor have other Churches the lesse interest in it, because their conscience and modesty

will

will not suffer them to appropriate it to themselves, (for though they extend this promise of indefectibility to the whole Church, yet they reap the comfort and benefit of it, in as much as they are true members of that Church, and not upon any local or particular consideration.)

There is a fourth argument behind, taken from the Tradition or testimony of the present Church: but this I have discoursed at large, and I hope discovered the folly of that new device: thither I refer the Reader.

A fifth argument there is, and that is all I find in Mr *Cressy*, (for I have diligently searched him, and God is my witnesse I have indeavoured to single out the strongest and most plausible passages in him, which I had not answered before,) and that is taken from the Churches Unity: *One Church there cannot be, without one faith, nor one faith where differences are irreconcileable, and no reconciling of differences, but by an authority, and that infallible. Append. chap. 6 n 3.* And again: *The Sun shines not more clear* (I suppose he means in the Cloysters of his Convent) *than that there is no possible Unity without Authority, nor no Christian Unity without an infallible Authority, ch 7. n 2.*

Answ. Very well; it being premised, That their only infallible Authority is, as Mr *Cressy* states it, the Church speaking by a general Councel, confirmed by the Pope, *Appen. chap. 4. num. 9* then if this Argument be solid, let Mr *Cressy* take what followes: Then there was neither one Church, nor one Faith, for the first 300 years, when there was no general Councel: then when the Pope dies, or his Sea is vacant other waies (as oft hath been) and when there is no Councel (as now there is none) there is no Unity in the Church of *Rome*: what thinks this man of the Gallican Church, which (unlesse they be throughly Jesuited) do still hold (as they used to do) that the Pope, personally considered, is not infallible,

but

but onely with a general Councel: will he justifie it at the Assembly of the French Clergy, that they have in this day no unity among them, and no way to reconcile their differences, because they have no infallible Authority? But I shall not waste my time any longer with these impertinent and miscal'led arguments: I shall leave the point with this short *Memorandum*, That it is a plain evidence of the desperateness of their cause, that all the great wit, and vast learning, and deep cunning of the Romish Doctors can furnish them with no better arguments than these. And since this is all that Mr *Cressy* can pretend for his Apostacy, I would intreat him in his next to furnish me with some Answers to those that suspect his change was not from conscience, but discontent or passion, or worldly interest, (as affaires then stood:) for I confesse I am at a losse, and know not what to say for him; and the rather, because the pretended motives of his Conversion are so ridiculously absurd, and incredible, among which I find two that deserve a special remark. One is the scandalous personal qualities of *Luther* and *Calvin*, which, if all that he saith of them were true and material, (as it is either notoriously false, or inconsiderable,) yet it amounts to nothing against the Protestant cause, since though we own them for eminent persons, and worthy instruments, yet we readily acknowledge, they were lyable to error, and subject to passions and infirmities, no lesse than other men, nor did we ever make them the Pillars and grounds of the Gospel, or the foundation and rule of our Faith. But that this should occasion his Change, I confess is beyond the faith of Miracles to believe. This is prodigious, That the supposed mistakes or miscarriages of two particular Protestant Doctors should really have greater influence to turn him from the Protestant Religion, than the real Blasphemies, and abominable filthinesses of their Masters and Pillars

of

of their Faith and Church, *viz.* the Popes should have to alienate him from the Popish Religion; and these things not feigned by Adversaries, (as most of their Calumnies against *Luther* and *Calvin* are) but acknowledged by their own Authors, who have left us a particular account of the several sorts of their villanies: so many blasphemers, as *John* 13. *Julius* 3. *&c.* so many Hereticks as *Boniface* 8. *John* 23. so many Conjurers, as *Sylvester* the second, and his Successors for many Successions; so many whoremongers, so many Sodomites, Poysoners, Incestuous, and what not? 150 Popes (saith *Genebrard*) rather Apostatical than Apostolical persons. And yet this tender conscienced man, who knew all these things, and could bear with all this, and a thousand more such infirmities in the Popes, was so squeamish that he was not able to endure the scandals of *Luther* and *Calvin*. And another motive he addes, not at all inferior to the former, *viz.* The bloudy commotions of the *Calvinists*, and the sanguinary Lawes and cruel execution of them upon Catholick Priests in England: And this was a great offence to him, who was well acquainted with the Massacres of *France*, of *Germany*, and the Low Countries, and the *English* too in Popish times, who knew the History of the barbarous cruelties of the inquisition torments, who himself had been an eye and ear-witnesse of the inhumane butcheries of above one hundred thousand innocent Protestants in *Ireland*. But all this did not move the good man at all: he could swallow Camels, but a Gnat hath Choaked him. O Divelish Hypocrisy! But God will not be mocked, and I hope men that have any sence will not easily be deceived to believe the sincerity of that mans Conversion, which is brought on by ridiculous Motives. But to return.

For a close of this great point, I shall leave three things to the consideration of any discreet & conscienti-

ous

ous Reader, and particularly of our two English Apostates, with whom am now treating, if they have any sense of Eternity or Conscience left.

1. That the principal Texts of Scripture, and argument urged by them and others for the Infallibility of the Pope and Councel together, either prove nothing to their purpose, or prove more than they would have or dare assert, *i. e.* they prove either the Pope or Councel to be infallible by themselves, and without any reference to the other, and are accordingly pleaded by each party for their opinion. As for instance: *Thou art Peter, upon this rock* &c. *I will give unto thee the keyes* &c. *And Simon - I have prayed, that thy Faith fail not*: and the like. If these Texts Prove any Infallibility, they prove the infallibility of the Pope, or St. *Peter's* Successor, whether with or without a Councel. So on the other side, the Texts of Scripture pleaded for the Infallibility of Councels from what was said to or of all the Apostles: *He that heareth you, heareth me. It seemed good to the holy Ghost and us. Where two or three are gathered together, I am with you to the end of the world*: If these Texts prove any Infallibility, they Prove the Infallibility of all the Governours of the Church and Successors of the Apostles, at least when they are assembled together, without any speciall reference to the Pope, who is but one of them. And because it is sufficiently evident, that these places do not prove the infallibility of those, of whom they are acknowledged primarily and formally to speak, (which is so evident, that we have thousands of the most learned and resolved Papists consenting to us herein, as is before proved,) it is therefore a strange presumption to pretend these places cogent proofs of the infallibility of them, of whom these Texts are confessed not to speak save onely by implication: and consequently the infallibility of Pope and Councel together, (which is the chief retreat of the most subtile

tile and cautious Papists) is destitute of solid proof, and an ungrounded assertion.

2. If all that these men say were granted, that a general Councel confirmed by the Pope were the infallible Judge, yet since there is now no such thing, (nor like to be,) as a general Councel in the Church of *Rome*, but the Pope stands upon his own legs, therefore the Church of *Rome* at this day is not infallible, and hath no infallible Judge, and no way to end their Controversies, nor any advantage above Protestants therein. If they say, the Pope hath the assistance and concurrence of general Councels in their writings and Decrees, I answer: The infallible Judge, which they plead for, must according to their principles be a living Judge, and therefore requires the existence of the Councel, as well as of the Pope. I would aske Mr *Cressy* this question: Is the Pope infallible in his exposition and application of the Decrees of Councels, or no? if he be, then the Pope alone is infallible without a Councel (which himself confesseth is a proposition so harsh, that Protestants should not be urged to acknowledge it.) if he be not, they they have no infallible Judge at *Rome* at this time, ὅ ἐστι δεινόν.

3. Since the present Romanists have now no Anchorhold but the Popes Infallibility, (for general Councel there is none,) and by Mr *Cressy*'s argument, if there be no Infallibility, there is no Authority, and therefore no Unity, and therefore no Faith: I shall desire the Reader to reflect upon the character of that person, who is so boldly asserted the Supreme infallible Judge of all controversies in Religion: I will not take it from Protestants (least they should be thought partial,) but as it is drawn by a Papist, & he too one *non è multis*, one so eminent for learning & prudence, and trustinesse, that he was imployed by the French Bishops to manage that great affair against the Jesuites at *Rome*: it is St. *Amour*, in that famous & known

known book, his Journal concerning the Transactions at *Rome*, relating to the five propositions controverted between the *Molinists* and *Jansenists*, where it is left upon Record *in perpetuam mei memoriam*, That when he sollicited the Pope (*Innocent* the Tenth) to decide that controversie, and to that end *presented a paper to him, desiring him to read it, the Pope* (saith my Author) *would not receive and read it, because he said this would engage him further, and oblige him to too great toiles, as he knew the discussion of this matter required, even of such as had applied themselves to that study all their time, but much more paines must it cost him than others, because* (said he, they are the Popes own words) *it is not my profession, besides that I am old, I have never studied Divinity: Part.* 3. *chap.* 12. And yet this is the ground and pillar of Truth, this is the prime subject of infallibility, the great judge of all controversies, (to whom Scripture, Reason, Spirit, all must vaile,) whose Decisions must be taken for the Oracles of God. And the same Pope *Innocent* the Tenth tels this story of a predecessor of his, *Clement* the 8. *who* (saith he) *after he had caused this matter* (viz. the question between the *Jansenists* and *Jesuites*) *to be debated in his presence for a long time by the most excellent men, after he had studied them himself with very great care, (so that as he remembred, some took occasion thereby to say, that Clement the* 8 *began very old to study Divinity,) yet he could not at last decide any thing therein, but was fain to impose a perpetual silence upon both sides.* This is the man that must infallibly decide all controversies, that could not decide this, and we (forsooth) must all venture our soules upon his unerring guidance, that is not convinced of it himself, and our Papists most impudently assert the Popes infallibility, who modestly acknowledged his own ignorance and insufficiency. These things I hope may abundantly suffice for the demolishing of the grounds of their Faith, I must

now speak something to the establishing of ours. The rather, because the Captain requires it in his Answerer, not to proceed in the way of Negatives, not to rest in pulling down, but to assert what we should establish. And Mr *Cressy* takes notice of Mr *Chillingworth* and his book, that he was better in pulling down buildings, than raising new ones, and that he hath managed his Sword much more dexterously than his Buckler; and that Protestants do neither own and defend the positive grounds which *Chillingworth* laid, nor provide themselves of any safer defence. *Exomolog. sect. 2. chap. 3. num. 4.*

To which it might suffice in general to reply, that if once the grounds of their Faith be demolished, and their great pretensions of supreme & infallible Authority subverted; if it be proved, that neither the Pope, nor Councels, nor Church of *Rome* be infallible, then the Protestant Churches at least stand upon even ground with the Church of *Rome*, and whatsoever they can reasonably pretend for the establishing of their Faith, will tend to the securing of ours; and if Protestants have no solid and sufficient Foundation for their Belief, neither have the Papists any better; and then one of these two things will follow; either that Scripture, Reason, and the concurring testimony of former Ages, and Churches, and Fathers are a firme Basis for a Christians Faith independently upon the Churches Authority, and infallibility, (and this is a certain truth, though utterly destructive to the Church of *Rome*,) or else, (which I tremble to speak, and yet these desperate persons are not afraid to assert,) that the Christian Faith hath no solid ground to rest upon, (I mean, without the Churches infallible Authority, which is now supposed to be discarded and disproved.) Now here it must be confessed, that some Protestants expresse themselves too unwarily in the point, whereby they give the Adversary some seeming advantage and occasion

occasion to represent our Doctrine to their ignorant and deluded Proselytes, as diversified into three or four several and contrary opinions, about the judge and rule of Faith, which some are said to ascribe to the Scriptures, others to the spirit of God within them, others to reason, and others to universal Tradition, whereas indeed all these are really agreed, and these are not so many several Judges or Rules, but in all their places and orders do happily correspond to the constitution of the Protestant ground of Faith, which I shall make thus appear by the help of a threefold distinction.

1. We must distinguish between the Judge and Rule of Faith, which the Papists cunningly and some others inconsiderately confound. For instance, if I should assert the Church to be Judge, or Reason to be the Judge, yet the Scripture is the Rule, to which the Judge is tyed, and from which if it swerve, so far forth its sentence is null.

2. We must distinguish between Judge and Judge, and here we must take notice of a triple Judge according to the triple Court, *forum cœli, forum Ecclesiæ, forum Conscientiæ*, the Court of Heaven, the Court of the Church, and the Court of Conscience. Accordingly there are three Judges.

1. The supreme and truly infallible Judge of all controversies, and that is God and Christ, who appropriates it to himself to be the *alone law-giver*, *Jam* 4.12. And this is so proper to God, that the blessed Apostles durst not ascribe it to themselves, (however their Successors are grown more hardy) *not for that we have dominion over your Faith*, 2 *Cor.*1.24. This Judge is Lord over all, both in the Church and in the Conscience, which are all subordinate to him.

2. There is an external and political Judge, placed by God in the Church, and these are the Governours

whom Christ hath placed in and over the Church: and these are subordinate to the Supreme Judge, who if they really contradict his soveraign sentence and higher Authority, and require things evidently contrary to the will of their and our Master, must give their subjects leave to argue with the Apostle *Peter* (and I tell you it was an unhappy accident that St. *Peter* should furnish the Protestants with such an Argument, as would puzzle all his Successors to answer,) *Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God judge ye,* Acts 4.19.

3. There is an internal and secret Judge, placed by God in every particular person, and that you may call Reason or Conscience; for as God hath made every man a reasonable creature, and capable to judge of his own actions, so he hath not given that faculty (no more than the rest) to be for ever suspended, and wrapt in a napkin, but to be duely exercised, nor would he have men like bruit beasts that have no understanding; but every where he calls upon them to judge: *I speak to wise men, judge ye what I say,* 1 Cor.10.15. And the service God requires of every man must be λογικὴ λατρεία *reasonable service, Rom.* 12.1. And every man must be ready and able to give a reason of the hope that is in him, 1 *Pet.* 3.15.

4. We must distinguish between an instrument and an argument. And here lies the golden mean, by which a man may avoid those contrary Heresies both equidistant from the Truth, I mean the Socinian on the one hand, and the Papist on the other, whereof the former would make reason a soveraigne universal judge to which even Scripture it self must vaile: And some go so high, that I remember one of them saith, *If the Scripture should say in expresse termes, that Christ is the most high God, I should not believe it* (*because utterly repugn-*

repugnant to reason) *but seek some other sence of those words.* And the latter (the Romanists) would quite put reason out of office, and *in terminis* submit to a blind or implicit obedience without any examination, whereas the truth lies between both. Reason or Conscience is not an argument, (I mean in matters of Faith purely such,) that is, I do not therefore believe such a Doctrine of Faith to be true, because my reason or conscience in it self, and by virtue of rational and extrascriptural Arguments tels me it is true (for this were to make my Reason the rule and standard of truth) but my reason or conscience believes such a thing to be true, because it reads or hears such Arguments and evidences from the Scripture as are the undoubted κριτηρια of the Truth. And thus reason is the instrument, by which I apprehend the Argument which compels my beliefe. So again, the Spirit of God, (as in this controversie it is taken for the gifts or graces of a believing Soule) or its ordinary suggestions in my mind, are not the argument by which I am convinced of the Truth of a Doctrine, (for I may be deceived by a false spirit under the Title of Gods, and I am commanded to trie the Spirits, and not to believe every Spirit) it is the instrument (as I may so speak) by which I am enabled to understand the weight and force of those Arguments which are recorded (suppose) in the Scriptures, or rather, to speak more properly, reason is the instrument, and God's Spirit is the great Helper and Assistant by which that instrument is elevated and fitted to discern those lineaments of Truth which God hath drawn in Scripture or elsewhere, whence alone the Arguments for proof of the Truth are derived. So now the state of the question is reduced to a narrow compasse, and I shall lay it down in these Propositions.

1. Supreme and infallible judge upon earth we know none, and I hope from what hath been said and proved

at large it appears that therr is none, at leaſt the Pope, and Councel, and Church of *Rome* is none.

2. An external Political judge in the Church we willingly acknowledge and reverently eſteem, the true and rightful Governours of the Church orderly aſſembled, and proceeding regularly in Councels (whether leſſer or larger) are the external judge, whoſe deciſions are to be highly valued, whoſe orders are not raſhly to be deſpiſed or contradicted, yet three Cautions we muſt interpoſe. 1. That this Judge is not infallible, but ſubject to error. 2. That this Judge being ſubject to an higher Authority, and tied to an higher rule, if its deciſions or commands be manifeſtly repugnant to that ſuperiour authority and rule, they are not to be received and obeyed. 3. That this Judge is conſtituted by God in the Church, not for the command of men's conſciences, but for the regulation of their actions, and for the preſervation of the peace of the Church, which is not violated by mens inward and unknown ſentiments, but by their external demeanor and ſenſible effects of them: And therefore this is abundantly ſufficient for the preſervation of order and peace in the Church.

3. Every mans own reaſon and conſcience is judge for himſelf, and for the guidance of his own actions. State it in this manner, and I know no hurt at all in making reaſon a Judge: Chriſt himſelf, when he preached in the World, he propounds the articles of Faith to the reaſons of his hearers, and cals upon every one of them to judge (ſo far as concerned his own apprehenſions or actions,) *Luk.* 12. 57. *Yea, and why even of your ſelves judge you not what is right?* Chriſt no where commands his hearers blindly to ſubmit to the decrees of the preſent judge their Church, the high-prieſt and Councel, but cals upon them to judge for themſelves, to beware of the Leaven, *i. e.* the falſe Doctrine of their Rulers, *Matth.* 16. 12, and

and (which is more) refers his own doctrine to their searching, which is an act of reason, *John* 5.39. *Search the Scriptures.* But alas this reason is imperfect, and corrupt, and dim sighted in matters of Faith, therefore something farther is necessary. Therefore

Prop. 4. That reason may be a competent Judge of matters of Faith, it is necessary that it be assisted and elevated by the spirit of God, whereby of the rational he is made a spiritual man, and *eo nomine* a fit judge of such affairs, 1 Cor. 2.15. *He that is spiritual, judgeth all things.* And that a man may exactly see those Heavenly bodies, which are at a great distance from us, it is necessary to look upon them through a Glasse, without which a man could not discern many of them: So are the aides of Gods spirit to help our purblind reason, which without these could not discern things afarre off, according to 2 *Pet.* 1.9.

Prop. 5. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the infallible rule, and ground, and touchstone of Faith, by which both Churches and all particular persons are to be regulated in their Faith and manners, from which all controversies of Faith are to be decided and judged, to which all are perfectly subordinate, by which all the opinions of men and decisions of Councels are to be examined, and they that swerve from and are opposite to this rule, are *ipso facto* null and void, and so to be esteemed by all Christians I rather call it a rule than a judge, because there is an ἀυτοπιστία in the word, the appellation of judge by common use being appropriated to persons, but it is the voice and writing of our Soveraign Lord and judge, by which all inferiour judges are to be guided in their decrees.

Propos. 6. Universal Tradition rightly understood (viz. the concurring testimony of all Churches, and ages, and persons in their Writings left us) is of great use and

force, and is the *vehiculum* or Channel, by which the Scripture, (which alone is our rule) is conveyed to us. But here I must adde these too Cautions.

1. Tradition, though necessary to convey the rule to us, yet it is no part of the rule. I must here distinguish between *res tradita* the thing delivered, & *traditio* the Tradition or delivery of it: If Tradition be understood in the former sense (as the Papists understand it) for certain unscriptural Doctrines delivered by Tradition, we know no such thing, and by comparing the boldnesse of their pretensions to such Tradition, with the weaknesse of their proofs and evidences, we plainly discern they can make out no such thing: But if Tradition be taken for the conveyance or delivery it self, or for the Testimony of the Church successively given to the Truths and Books of the Scripture, we confesse it is of great use and in some sort necessary to bring the Rule to us, yet (as I say) it is no part of the Rule. As that bread which nourisheth me, it is necessary that it be brought to me in some Basket or other *vehiculum*, yet it is the Bread alone, not the Basket which nourisheth me. The Water of such a remote but excellent spring, which quencheth my thirst, could not come to me, if there were not a channel to convey it, yet it is the Water alone which refresheth me, not the Channel. The Decrees or Acts of Kings and Parliament are the onely Rule by which our forreign Plantations are governed, and to which such as are judges there are tyed (yea so farre tyed, that if those Judges should impose contrary commands, as for example, if they should command the people to rebell against the King, they are bound not only to examine their commands, but to disobey them) But it is altogether necessary that there should be a ship, wherein such Acts or Decrees should be conveyed to them, yet it were a very absurd thing to say the ship is a part of the rule, though the

Papists

Papists (whilst from the necessity of Tradition they infer that it is a part of the rule) do apparently runne into the same solœcisme. In a word, Tradition was not appointed by Christ as a part of that ground upon which we were to build our rule, by which we were to try particular Doctrines and Articles of Faith, but was necessary, not *ex institutoChristi*, but *ex natura rei*, & from the condition of humane affairs, there being no other way (without a new revelation) possible or imaginable to convey the Gospel and Scriptures to those that were to live so many hundred years after the first publication of it: Tradition being to us, that which Eyes and Eares were to them that were Eye witnesses of his convincing miracles, and Ear-witnesses of his irrefragable discourses, that is, neither their Eyes and Eares were, nor to us Tradition is the Argument and ground of our Faith, but a necessary meanes or instrument to convey those Arguments and grounds of Scripture which were convincing and satisfactory.

2. This Tradition is no Act of Authority, but onely of testimony, not at all peculiar to the Church or generall Councels, but common to all antient Writers: Yea let it be observed as a very material consideration in this point, so far is the Capacity of a Church from being necessary to the validity of this Tradition and Testimony, concerning the great rule of our Faith the Holy Scriptures, that the Testimony and Tradition of such as neither are the Church nor any part of it, but enemies to it (I meane Jewes and Heathens) are in some respects more considerable, according to that known maxime--*Testimonium adversarii contra se est validissimum.* It being one of the best Arguments (and at this day so urged both by Protestants and Papists) for the truth of the Holy Scriptures, and particularly of the Gospel, that the truth of those Historical relations of Christs miracles was acknowledged

knowledged by the most Learned Jewes and Heathen that lived in antient times. And by those considerations we may discerne the vanity of that triviall calumny of the great differences among Protestants about the rule of Faith and judge of Controversies, whereas by what hath been said (which is no other than the common Doctrine of the Protestant Churches and Writers, however sometimes they seem to differ in *modo explicandi*) it appeares how all these several things concurre like so many Stones fitly compacted together to make up the building of our Faith; which (that I may in few words present it to the Readers review) is this:

The Scripture is the Object, the onely rule and standard of Faith, by which all controversies of Faith are to be decided and judged, the *res credita*, and the *ratio credendi*. Tradition is the Vehicle to conveigh this rule to us and our times: Reason is the instrument by which I apprehend, or the eye by which I discerne or see this rule: The spirit of God is the Eye-salve that anoints mine Eye, and inables it to see this rule: The Church is the interpreter (though not infallible and authentick,) the witnesse, the guardian of this rule, and the applier of the general rules of Scripture to particular cases, and times, and circumstances.

And things being thus stated (which is really the sence of Protestants in this great point, as it were easy to shew from the confessions of our Churches and the Treatises of our most and choicest Authors) it is not at all difficult to blow away with a breath those pitiful cavils, whereby they indeavour to perplex the mind of ignorant or prejudiced persons, lest the light of the Gospel should shine into their minds. One thing is worth our Observation, That diverse of the Popish arguments do wholly arise from, and depend upon, either some incommodious expressions of some Protestant Writers, or some

some false expositon put upon them by the Adversaries; As for instance, when they argue against the Scripture from the nature of a Judge, that a Judge must hear parties, must not be mute, but passe sentence, &c. All these, and many such cavillations are thus silenced by saying that which is true, that it is an ἀνυπόπτως and figurative expression when we call Scripture a Judge, inasmuch as it is the voice or writing of our Judge, and indeed it is a rule; So their Arguments against the judgment of reason, either have no weight in them at all, or else depend upon a scandalous and untrue suggestion, as if the Protestants made reason the Judge in a Socinian sence: So their Arguments against the Spirits being Judge do proceed, I doubt, from a wilfull mistake, (for in their Learned Writers it cannot be ignorance) as if the Protestants submitted Scripture and reason and all to the judgment of the Spirit in themselves in an Enthusiastick notion, which is so far from being true, that they try and judge of the Spirit by the Word according to Apostolicall prescription. This being premised, I come now to treat with my Captaine, and weigh his Arguments that have any colour or appearance of truth in them.

And first he argues against reasons being the judge of Controversies; concerning which let me be bold to say thus much, That the Papists themselves do make reason judge of Controversies as farre as the Protestants do, though both the one and other tye up this Judge to a rule. If it be said the Protestants make the reason of every particular man judge, (which indeed they do, in the sence forementioned and for their own actions) so do the Papists make the reason of the Pope or a Councel the Judge; For when they say the Pope or Councel is the judge of Controversies, I would know what it is in them, if not their reason which is the judge, as it is their reason which examineth, and heareth, and considereth,

so

so sure it is the same reason which concludeth and judgeth, so that the question between the Papists and Protestants is not whether Reason be the judge, but whether the reason of particular persons, or the reason of the Pope or Councel.

The Arguments which he urgeth against the judgment of reason are so Irrational that it is sufficient confutation to mention them.

1. (*Saith he*) Reason must submit to the Judge, *E.* it is not the Judge. *Answ.* It is true, supreme Judge it is not, but subordinate and tied to rule: Protestants assent no more.

2. The Judge must be Infallible; but reason is Fallible, *Ergo.* *Answ.* The Major is a pitifull *petitio principii*, They that help'd him to make his Book will tell him what it meanes.

3. If reason were Judge, a man might please God without Faith, for reason would teach us sufficiently how to please God. *Answ.* The same Argument will overthrow his Church: If the Church be the Judge, then a man may please God without faith, for the Church teacheth us sufficiently how to please God.

4. If Reason be Judge we must not believe what we do not understand.

Answ: Non sequitur, For this Judge is tied up to a Law and Rule which commands us to believe what we do not understand.

But I am sick of such woful Arguments, though the poore Captaine hath no better, and therefore I will quit that work and come to that which is more material *viz.* To try whether he hath any better against the Scripture: And here also I shall do his cause that right as with him to take into consideration what is said by Mr *Cressy* in his *Exomologesis*, which I am the more willing to do, because if the Popish cause have any strength in it, and if the

Doctrine

Doctrine of the Scripture alone being Judge and rule of Controversies be untrue and indefensible (as they pretend it is) we may expect the demonstration of it from a man of his wit and learning and experience in the Controversy, as having thoroughly considered all pretensions and arguments of both parties, and taken in the advice of the most famed Doctors of the Romish Church. But I must not dissemble that I was wofully disappointed in the perusal of Mr *Cressy*'s piece, and whereas I expected something solid and substantial, or at least very plausible, which I might have some ground in charity to believe might give at least a colour for his change, I find little in him worthy of conderation, but what hath already received satisfactory Answers: Yet because the cause affords no better Arguments, I shall briefly consider what he and the Captain and his assistants deliver in this matter.

That the Scripture is not the onely rule of Faith and Judge of Controversies, is the Proposition they attempt to prove, and their arguments are those which follow.

Arg. 1. Scripture cannot be this Judge and Rule, because *it doth not answer its end, for they that own this Judge disagree among themselves*, Everard Epist. pag. 33. *Scripture doth not reconcile them.* Thus *Cressy, by this rule it is impossible that ever Controversies should be ended. Sect. 2. chap. 4. n. 1.*

Answ: Scripture might be (as really it was) designed, instituted and ordained for the ruling of mens Faith and the judging and deciding Controversies, though through the depravedness of men this end might not be obtained: If this Argument have any weight in it, I may upon the same ground argue thus: Preaching of the Gospel was not instituted for the salvation of the World, because it doth not answer its end, but proves to many a savour

of

of death. Or the Law of God was not instituted by God for a rule of Life, because it doth not obtaine its end, and men will not be ruled by it. In a word, let it be observed, if this Argument prove any thing, it proves what the very Papists deny, that the Scripture is not so much as part of the rule, neither of Faith nor manners, for still according to the present Argument it doth not Answer its end, for there is no one controversie in Faith, which Scripture alone decides so as to silence all differences, which is the thing pretended necessary to a Judge of Controversies. For the further discovery of the impertinency and vanity of this Argument, however it is their *Goliah* which they most boast of, I shall offer them this *Dilemma* relating to that power of ending all differences among Christians, which they suppose was necessary for, and by Christ committed to the Judge of controversie, Either (I say) that power is absolute, unconditional and effectual, and if so, there could be no Heresies, Schismes, or differences in the Christian World, which we see is most false, or it is a conditional power sufficient of it self for the ending of difference, though frustrable and impedible in its effects by the ignorance or perverseness of men (which is the real truth.) And in this sence the Scripture may be judge, *i. e.* there is enough in it said and clearly delivered, by which all controversies might be ended, if men would be humble, studious, and self-denying: and in the former sence the Church of *Rome* is no judge of Controversies. Peradventure it will be said that all men are bound to submit and hearken to all the decrees of the Church of *Rome*, and when they do so submit, it is an effectual means to end all differences: In the very same manner and upon farre better grounds I say of the Scripture, that all are bound to submit and hearken to all its Councels and decrees, and when they do so, it will effectually end all Controversies

versies. If it be further said, that the Church hath a power of coercion to compel dissenters to submit: I answer, either that coercion they speak of is spiritual by Church censures and excommunication, *&c.* or civill by corporal penalties, death, *&c.* If they understand it of civil coercion that is not at all necessary nor intrinsecal to an Ecclesiastical judg of controversies, otherwise the Apostles (who had not this civil power) nay Christ himself (who denies that he was judge or ruler) should not be such a Judge, and the Church for the first 300 years had no judge of Controversies: Nay, the Papists themselves in pretence at least abjudicate this from the Church, and refer it wholly to the civil power. If they speak of a spiritual coercion, then the Scripture hath such a power of inflicting spiritual penalties upon its violaters & contemners, such as obduration, and ejection from the presence of God, and such excommunication as the other is but a shadow of it: And whether they speak of one or other, the Protestant Judge of controversies is not destitute of either advantage: If it be remembred that the Protestants own an Ecclesiastical Political Judge, which Judge although their modesty will not suffer them to pretend to Infallibility, and a power to oblige all people to receive all their decrees though anti-spiritual without enquiry; and though they say with the Apostle, they have their power for edification, not for destruction, 2 *Cor.* 13. 10. and they can do nothing against the Truth but for the Truth, and though it is their advice to their people, which was the councel of the Apostle to his people, 1 Cor. 11. 1. *Be followers of me even as I also am of Christ*: Yet they have a power to explaine and maintaine the Doctrines of the Scripture, & they acknowledge a power in the Magistrate by civil sanctions and penalties to suppresse and restraine such as shall corrupt the Truth and infect peoples soules with the poyson of Heretical

Doctrines

Doctrines. And this may abundantly serve for Answer to their *Achilles* or principal argument which makes such a noise in the world.

Arg. 2. Scripture cannot be a perfect rule, because some books of Scripture are lost, and it is the whole Scripture which is this rule.

Ans. 1. Then Tradition also cannot be a rule, for diverse Traditions are lost as *Cressy* confesseth, *Sect.* 1. *Ch.* 8. *n.* 5. and all the Papists acknowledge.

Answ. 2. It doth not at all appear that any one of those Books are lost which concerned controversies of Faith, or the rule of Life; All which to this day hath been proved is this, That some Books Written by Holy men and Prophets are lost: But it is a vaine imagination, without the shadow of a proof, that all which was written by such men was a part of Canonical or Divine Scripture, for we read that the *Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*, which inspired them not at all times, but onely when he pleased, there being this difference between the spirits inspiration of Christ and all other Holy men, that it was in Christ without measure, and without difference of time, but in the Apostles it was a gift, confined to such seasons and proportions as God saw fit for them. Is any man so absurd as to think that every letter which a Prophet or Apostle might write about any private affairs was a part of the Sacred Scripture? Or if *Solymons* Herball were extant, must it needs be admitted into the Canon of the Sacred Scripture? Or how can they prove (and if they do not prove it, this Argument is impertinent) that the Histories which *Joshua*, or *Nathan*, or *Samuel*, or *Gad*, &c. might or did write concerning the Warres of the Lord, or the Civill transactions of the Kingdomes of *Israel* and *Judah* must needs be a part of the Canon? Or did the temporary transient and extraordinary inspirations of

the

the Holy Ghost deprive them of their common gifts and faculties? And was the capacity of a Prophet inconsistent with that of an Historian? or because *Balaam* was once inspired, must we needs Canonize all that afterwards he spake, if it were extant? or because *Hannah* was once inspired, 1 *Sam.* 2. and *Simeon*, and *Elizabeth*, Luk. 1. did ever any man, unless in a dream, imagine that all their afterdiscourses were Canonical?

Answ. 3. Although *fragmenta auri sunt pretiosa*, the least shreads of Scripture are of inestimable value, yet we must distinguish between the essential and integral parts of the rule of Faith; every part and parcel of it is a choice blessing for our *bene esse* and more abundant direction and consolation, yet it is not an essential part of the rule of Faith, for the farre greatest part of those sacred Books is spent in the explication of such general Lawes & directions as were of themselves sufficient *strictè loquendo*, or the repetition of the same things, which mans dulnesse and backwardnesse to such things made highly expedient and beneficial. The five Books of *Moses* were sufficient to Salvation before any of the other Books were indited, and the following Writings of the Prophets were but Comments upon them, which if by God's Providence they had been lost, no doubt the first five Books would have been sufficient for Salvation for that state of the Church. So when St *Matthew* had written his Gospel wherein the doctrine of the person and office and works of Christ (who is the marrow of both Testaments, and the sole sufficient object of saving knowledge *John* 17. 3. is clearly revealed and fully proved, I do assert (and let any of our Adversaries prove the contrary if they can) that that had been sufficient for our Salvation. And yet it must be acknowledged a wonderful favour from God that he hath so plentifully provided for us, and so carefully watched by his Provi-

dence for the preservation of the several books of Scripture, that all the wit and learning of Adversaries can only furnish them with two instances of Apostolical writings which they suppose to be lost, *viz.* one Epistle from *Laodicea*, and another to the Corinthians.

Arg. 3. A rule must be plain and clear, but the Scriptures are dark and doubtful, and that in things appertaining to salvation, as appears from 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. – *things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest to their destruction.* Now this could not bring destruction, if they were not hard in things appertaining to salvation. And here the Captain musters up several necessary Doctrines which he supposeth not to be clearly laid down in Scripture.

Answ. The Scripture is plain and cleare in things necessary to Salvation, as hath been abundantly evinced by Protestants out of expresse Scripture, and consent of Fathers; But that belongs to another point, and I do not love to mingle distinct Questions together, therefore to them I shall referre the Reader, onely I shall take notice of such assaults as he hath made upon this Doctrine.

For the Text 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. I do confesse I do not meet with any passage so plausible as this in his whole Book: But the solution of the doubt is not difficult, if you consider, 1. To whom these things are said to be dark, even to ignorant, unstable, ungodlie men. When Protestants say Scripture is cleare, they do not mean it is so to those that are blind, or them that shut their eyes, or have discoloured eyes, (and such are they of whom those things are said) but unto such as are humble, and diligent in the use of meanes to find out the Truth; not onely some passages of St. *Paul* but in generall *all* Divine and spiritual Truths are dark to the naturall man (and such there is no reason to doubt these were) as it positively

tively asserted by the Apostle S. *Paul*, 1 Cor. 2. 14. *The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishnesse unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned*: and consequently, if the Popish argument from this place have any force in it, not onely some parts of Scripture will be dark, but not any part of it will be plaine, which the most impudent Papists durst never yet assert. 2. The wresting of the Scripture in any of its truths or doctrines is so great a sin, that it may well be called destructive, though the doctrine wrested be not simply necessary to salvation: as the disbelieve and contempt of any Truth or assertion plainly delivered by God, is confessed to be damnable, though the matter of the assertion be meerly circumstantial, and not at all in its self necessary to salvation.

3. St. *Paul's Scripture*, or difficult passage, might be wrested to direction, although the matter of them was not necessary to be known, or understood in order to Salvation. As for instance: That passage of St *Pauls*, *All things are lawful for me*, (*scil.* all indifferent things; for he there speaks of the use of meats, or observation of dayes,) This I say is not a fundamental Truth, nor is the knowledge of it necessary to Salvation, yet when the Libertines do abuse this Scripture, to justifie themselves in the practice of all wickednesse, doubtlesse they wrest the Scripture to their own destruction. Besides, the matter of a Text may be of lesser importance, and the knowledge thereof not necessary to salvation, and the first and immediate mistake of it may be in it selfe inconsiderable, and yet that may usher in other, and those higher mistakes, (as we see error is fruitful, and grows worse and worse,) & at last ends in destruction; as that cloud, which at first was no bigger than a mans hand, did quickly overcast the whole Heavens. The doctrine of predestination the Papists confesse is not fundamental, since their own

Doctors are divided about it; yet if any man from St. *Paul's* assertions of the efficacy and immutability of Predestination, should infer the unnecessarinesse of Sanctification to salvation, as some have done,) doubtlesse this man would wrest the Scriptures to his own destruction. But the Captain is not contented with a general imputation of darknesse to the Scripture, but pretends several instances of things necessary to salvation, which are not plain and clear in the Scriptures: His instances are these. 1. The nature and number of the Sacraments. 2. The number of the Canonical books, and that the Scriptures are the word of God. 3. The incorruption of the Scripture. 4. The understanding the true sence of Scripture, which is literal, which mystical. 5. The number of fundamental points. 6. The doctrine of the Trinity: and 7. other doctrines concerning the baptizing of Infants, and womens receiving the Eucharists, and the observation of the Lords day, and the doctrine which condemnes Rebaptization. All these (saith he) are necessary to salvation, and yet Scripture is not plain and clear in them. So that here are two assertions, and both of them false in most of the instances, and all are false in one of them. It pitties me to trifle away time in the particular answer of such impertinent allegations, did not the weaknesse of some in believing all that is boldly asserted, make it necessary.

For the 1. The Scripture is plain enough in describing the nature of those two Sacraments, which Christ hath instituted, as the Captain might easily have informed himself, if instead of going to *Knot*, and *Fiat Lux*, &c. he had looked into almost any of our Protestant systems, or common places of Divinity, whither I refer the Reader, having somewhat else to do, than to transcribe common places: And for the other 5 Sacraments I cannot say they are delivered in Scripture *more clearly* than the others,

thers, but I may say, they are *lesse darkly*, because indeed not delivered there at all, being onely a fiction of their own, of which God may say, *They never came into my mind.*

For the 2. It is a crude and false assertion which the Captain laies down, That it is necessary to salvation to believe all the books of the holy Scriptures to be the word of God, and to believe nothing to be the word of God which is Apocryphal. If the latter part be true, wo to the Church of *Rome* that now is, which hath owned those writings for the word of God in the Councel of *Trent*, which by the judgment of so many most learned Fathers and grave Councels, and the Church of so many successive ages have ever been held for Apocryphal, as no rational man can doubt, that shall take the paines to read either of those excellent pieces, *Raynoldus de libris Apocryphis*, or Bishop *Cousens* his scholasticall history of the Canon of the Scripture. And if the former part be true, then we must damne all those Fathers and Churches, who (as both Papists and Protestants acknowledge) did sometimes doubt of some books now universally received: nay farther, we must damne all the former ages, and Churches, and innumerable holy and learned Writers, and even many of the most famous Papists themselves, who did all disown and disbelieve some at least of those Books, which (if we take the judgment of the *Trent* Councel) are and were a part of the word of God. The truth is, (and so it is generally owned by Protestant writers) That the belief of those Truths contained in the Scriptures is necessary to salvation, though happily a man through ignorance or error should doubt about some one book. It is necessary that I should believe the history of Christs life and death, but it is not necessary to salvation simply and absolutely to believe that the Gospel of St. *Mark* (for instance) was written by divine inspirati-

on. This may appear from hence, because Faith is sufficient for Salvation, and *faith comes by hearing*, Rom. 10 as well as by reading: now as Faith might be, and really was wrought by the hearing of the doctrine and history of Christ, when preached by such Ministers as were not divinely inspired, so might it be wrought by the reading of such things, when written by the very same persons, and consequently it was not, and is not necessary to the working of Faith, (and therefore to the procuring of salvation,) to believe, that St. *Marks* Gospel was written by Divine inspiration. And yet I do not assert this, as if I thought that it were not a very great sin, (especially in and after so much light about it) to disbelieve any one book of the Scriptures, there being so many evident characters of a Divine inspiration upon the particular books, besides the general assertion, 2 Tim. 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by divine inspiration*, and other convincing places, but onely to shew, That (which is a certain and evident Truth) it is not simply and absolutely, and *ex natura rei* necessary for every person to believe every particular Book to be the word of God, but a serious and practical belief of the Truths conteined in those Books, may be sufficient to salvation, even where there is an ignorance (if not wilful and affected) of the divine Authority of some book or books of Scripture.

3. For the third thing, the incorruption of the Scriptur, I answer

1. The Scriptures incorruption in substantial and considerable points, besides that it is confessed by the learned Papists (as I have shewed before) doth sufficiently appear from it self, by the collation of one place of Scripture with another, as also by the collation of several copies. And one great argument of it may be fetched from (that which seems to thwart it, *viz.*) the various readings, which learned men have observed out of diverse

copies

Copies, let any man look into them as he finds them collected in the late *Polyglotte* Bible, and his own eyes shall witnesse, that howsoever the differences of Readings are numerous, yet they are not of any moment, and indeed the differences in lesser matters are a considerable evidence of the Scriptures uncorruptednes in great, wherein the Copies do wonderfully consent.

2. If the Scriptures not evidencing its own incorruption, hinder its being a rule, then neither can the Scripture be so much as a part of our Rule, which yet is granted by the most insolent of our Adversaries) for so the argument will carry it, if there be any strength in it, nor was the Decalogue a rule of life to the following generations of the Israelites, nor can the old and unrepealed acts of Parliament be a Rule to England, nor yet can Tradition be a Rule to the Papists, for the Papists not onely confesse its insufficiency to evince its own uncorruptedness, but acknowledge its actual corruption in several points, (as hath been shewed before:) nor can the Decrees of Popes and Councels be a rule, which being writings, must needs be liable to the same imperfections & corruptions, that the Scriptures, because writings, are said to be subject to: and consequently, there is no rule neither for Papists nor Protestants, but every one may do that which seems right in his own eyes.

4. He pretends it is necessary to Salvation to understand which is the true sense of Scriptures; when it is to be taken literally, when mystically, and this (saith he) cannot be understood from sole Scripture.

Anſ. Here also both Propositions are remarkably false. 1. It is not necessary to Salvation to a Christian to understand the true sense of every Scripture: if it were, what shall become of those Legions of poor deluded Papists, into whose devotion ignorance is so considerable an ingredient? who neither understand the sense, nor are

permitted to read the words of the Scripture. 2. The sense of Scripture in fundamental points is clear & intelligible, and that from Scripture, which is its own best interpreter. And if we consult the best Expositors, either Popish or Protestant, we shall find they never so well unfold Scripture riddles, (if I may so speak) as when they plow with the scriptures heifer. Every puny knowes the collation of parallel, or seemingly repugnant places; and the observation of the scope and coherence, and the like, are the best Keyes to find out the true sense of the Scripture, and sufficient to discover it, unlesse the Readers ignorance or negligence, pride or prejudice stand in his way. I will take an instance from the Captain himself of those scriptures which confute the *Arrians*: Joh. 10 30. *I and my father are one*; but (saith the Captain) the *Arrian* will say this is meant of Oneness in affection, as *John* 17. 21. And here my Captain is gravelled, and half made an *Arrian*, and because he could not answer the *Arrian*, he concludes again, no body else can. But wiser men would have told him, that this *Arrian* glosse is confuted out of the scripture, both out of the present Chapter, (the Captain and *Arrian* being more blind than the Jewes, who understood Christs meaning better, *viz.* That he made himself God, *v.* 33.) and from other places of Scripture, where Christ is expressly called *God*, *Joh.* 1. 1. *the true God*, 1 Joh. 5 20. *and thought it no robbery to be equal with God*, Phil. 26. And indeed the Councel of *Nice* (as I shewed in the foregoing Discourse did confute the *Arrian* Heresy out of the scriptures, they saw no need of going further.

3. He alleadgeth the number of Fundamental points, which (saith he) the scripture determines not.

Ans. This is most false. The Scripture doth sufficiently determine fundamental points: I must not here run into another controversie concerning the number of fundamentals

damentals? This may suffice at present, That the Scripture doth not press all Truths with equal vehemency; that there are some points, wherein the Scripture doth, though not approve of, yet dispence with differing opinions in Christians: such as those were concerning dayes, and meats, and ceremonies in Religion: and there are other points, which it urgeth upon us with highest penalties; such as that in *Joh.*8.24. *If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall dye in your sins.* To me this is a rule: That to which God promiseth or annexeth salvation, is surely sufficient for salvation; I care not one straw for all the Romane Thunder-claps of Damnation, where I have one promise from God for my salvation. I am assured by God that *to fear God, and keep his commandement, is the whole duty of man,* Eccles. 12.13. *That he that feareth God, and worketh righteousnesse, is accepted of him,* Acts 10.35. *That this is life eternal, to know thee to be the onely true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,* Joh. 17.3. and consequently if I know him, and believe in him, his person, and office, and work, I may humbly put in my claime for eternal life, and have not so much reason to fear their cursing of me, (knowing that the curse causeleſse shall not come) as they have to fear the curse of God, and an addition to their plagues for adding to God's word, *Rev.*22.18. In a word, the fundamentals or substantials of Religion do apparently lie in two things, the Law, and the Gospel: the Scripture tels me, *that love is the fulfilling of the law,* Rom.13.10. *that he that loveth Christ shall be loved of his father,* Joh.14.21. *that hereby we know that we are passed from death to life, because we love the brethren,* 1 *Joh.*3.14. It tels me also, That faith in Christ is the fulfilling of the Gospel: *ye believe in God, believe also in me,* Joh.14.1. *and those things are written, that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life in his name,* Joh.20.31. Christ hath assured

assured us, (it seems he should have asked his Vicar's leave for it,) *He that believeth on me hath everlasting life*, Joh.3.30. For my part I am not afraid to venture my salvation upon this promise: and for Popish comminations and curses, I shall only say with the Psalmist, *Let them curse, but blesse thou*, Psal.109.28.

By these things we see the Scripture sufficiently informes us of fundamentals. To which I might adde the common sense of Gods Church, and the learned Ministers in all ages, it having been acknowledged by the most eminent Doctors, both antient and modern, both Popish and Protestant, (as may be seen at large in Dr *Potters want of Charity charged upon Romanists*, and Mr *Chillingworths* Defence of it,) That the Creed, commonly called the Apostles Creed, doth contain in it a compleat body of the fundamentals of salvation for the *Credenda*, and all the Articles of the Creed are sufficiently evidenced from the Scriptures, as I could with great facility demonstrate, but I study brevity.

But you must know, the Church of *Rome* hath another notion of Fundamentals, a rare notion I tell you, for you shall not find the like either in Scripture, or any antient Author. They make the Churches definition the rule of Fundamentals: That is a Fundamental Truth, and *de fide*, which the Church determines and decrees, though never so inconsiderable, and that is no Fundamental, nor *de fide*, which the Church hath not determined, though it be never so material. Thus to fast in Lent, and on Fridaies, if the Church command it, is now become a Fundamental, and if any man obstinately refuse it, *God will assuredly condemne such a person*, saith an English Apostate, *Cressy sect. 2. ch. 13. n. 2.* though he there confesseth it is but an action little more than circumstantial: yet on the other side it is no Fundamental to hold, That all men (except Christ) are conceived in sin, because the Church (forsooth) hath

not

not determined the Question of the Blessed Virgin. Thus with the Romanists it is a fundamental doctrine to believe that *Paul* left his Cloak at *Troas*, (namely if the Church injoyn you to believe it, for there is the knack; it is not Fundamental, because St. *Paul* asserts it, 2*Tim.*4.13. but because St. *Peters* successor of the Church injoyns you to believe it:) but it is no Fundamental, that Christ is God, if the Church doth not oblige you to believe it. Did I say it was not a Fundamental? I do them wrong in not speaking the whole truth; for so far are they from owning it for a Fundamental Article, that they will not allow it to be an article or object of our Faith, without such confirmation and injunction from the Church, as I shewed in the beginning of the foregoing Discourse. But this is so grosse a cheat, and such a groundlesse imposture, wholly destitute of all appearance of proof, that it is a vanity to spend time in the confuting of it. If any Papist think otherwise, let him give us solid proofs, That the Pope or Councel have such dominion over our Faith; That Fundamentals are all at their mercy; though methinks the very mention of such a conceit is abundant confutation, nor can any man be more absurd, than to say, That it is no Fundamental to believe *that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him*, (unlesse the Churches Authority command us to believe it,) and that it is a Fundamental to believe that (which so many of the Antients did not believe, *viz.* the falsehood of the Millenary opinion, or of the admission of departed Saints to the Beatifical Vision before the day of Judgement, (because these are determined by the Church:) And there is nothing which more essentially overthrows the Popish conceit of Fundamentals, than the consideration of the Pillar upon wich they build it, which is the Churches Infallible authority, as the Answerer of Bishop *Laud* Discourseth, whose great argument is this: *whoso-*

ver

ever refuseth to believe any thing sufficiently propounded to him for a truth revealed from God, commits a damnable sin: but whosoever refuseth to believe any point sufficiently propounded to him or defined by the Church as matter of the faith refused to believe, a thing sufficiently propounded to him for a truth revealed from God: this is proved from hence, because general Councels cannot erre. Where to say nothing of the Major, you see this man proves (and the Church of *Rome* hath no better proofs) *incertum per incertius*, their notion of Fundamentals from the opinion of Councels infallibility: and the infallibility of Councels having been abundantly evinced to be but a Chimærical Imagination, I must needs conclude, That the foundation being fallen, the superstructure needs no strength of argument to pull it down. If any desire to see this wild conceit baffled, he may find it done in that excellent discourse of Mr *Stillingfleets, part. 1. chap.* 2, 3, 4.

For the sixth particular, the doctrine of the Trinity: it is true, that is a real Fundamental, but to say, that is not clearly proved from the scripture, and for one that pretends he was a Protestant to say thus, I confesse it is one of those many arguments, which gives us too much occasion to ascribe the Captains change to any thing rather than to the convictions of his conscience, or the evidence of his cause. Behold the harmony between *Socinianisme* and Popery! Rather than not assert the Churches authority, these men will renounce the great principles of Christianity, and put this great advantage into the *Socinians* hands, to confesse that they cannot be confuted by scripture. But the learned Papists are of another mind in their lucid intervals, and some of them (as *Smiglecius*) have sufficiently overthrown the *Socinian* Heresy from scripture evidence: however I am sure Protestants have abundantly evinced it. Let any man read but those excellent discourses of *Placens* about the Præexistence of Christ

Christ before his birth of the Virgin, and his Divinity; and he will be of another mind. But this shewes the Captain was prepared to receive any thing, that could so easily believe a proposition, which he could not but know from his own experience to be horribly false, unless he were shamefully ignorant.

7. For the remaining points, they split upon the same Rocks with the former, for there is none of them but is sufficiently evident from Scripture, as hath been fully proved by those who have treated of those matters, (but I must forbear digressions.) And besides, (in the sense he intends) he will find an hard matter to prove their necessity to salvation: if he think otherwise, let him try his strength.

And this may satisfy the third argument concerning the *Scriptures* darkness in things said to be necessary to salvation.

A fourth argument urged against the Scriptures supremacy is, that we have not the Originals, but onely Copies and Translations, and these made by fallible men, and therefore it cannot be a certain rule of our Faith. This hath been answered in the former Discourse, it will suffice therefore briefly to suggest some few things.

1. This argument (if solid and weighty) will prove that no Copies nor Translations can be a Rule to us, that onely the Original Decalogue, which was written by Gods own fingers, was a Rule to the Jewes, and consequently, that Transcript of it which by Gods apointment the Prince had, and was obliged to read, was no rule to him: which how false it is, will appear from *Deut.* 17.18,19. —*When he sitteth upon the Throne,* —*he shall write him a Copy of this Law in a Book out of that which is before the Priests the Levites,* —*and he shall read therein,* —*that he may learn to keep all the words of this Law, and these Statutes to do them.* By which the Reader will quickly

ly discern what weight is in this part of the Discourse: That a Copy cannot be a certain rule, for the Princes rule is but a Copy, & the Transcription of that not limited to an infallible hand. When *Moses* of old time was read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day, *Acts* 15 21. it is to be presumed, each of them had not the Original of God's writing, yet was it never rejected from being a rule upon that account. What rare work would this notion make in a Kingdome, if throughly prosecuted? Belike the Captain doth not hold his Statute book a rule to him, because it is not the Original. And observe the horrible partiality of these men: The Decrees of the Pope or Councel, suppose of *Trent*, are a Rule and a certain one too to our English Papists, though they have nothing of them but a Copy and a Translation; but the Scripture cannot be a Rule, because it is onely a Copy and Translation. The law of God or the Church is a rule to the hearers, when it is delivered onely by a Popish Priest (and he confessedly fallible) by word of mouth, and it ceaseth to be a rule, when it is delivered by writing by a fallible hand: yet surely the one is but a copy as well as the other, though made by diverse instruments.

2. The copies and Translations of Scripture are a sure and certain rule, because they do sufficiently evidence themselves to be the word of God, and the same for substance with the Original. The incorruption of the Scriptures in substantial things is sufficiently evinced from the confession of its greatest Adversaries the Papists, from the consent of Copies taken by persons of several ages, and far distant places, and contrary principles, from the innumerable multitude of copiees every where dispersed, and the constant jealousy and watchfulnesse of so many wise and zealous Christians, ready to observe the least considerable corruption, & give warning of it, and many other considerations. All those arguments which are plea-

ded

ded both by Papists and Protestants for the Divinity of the Scripture, they reach to copies and Translations: In these, as well as in the Originals is the majesty of the Styl, the sublimity of the doctrines, the purity of the matter, the excellency of the design: To these as well as the Originals God hath given so many signal testimonies by the conversion of thousands, by frequent and illustrious miracles, by the cooperation of his Spirit with them in the hearts of his people, and many other arguments, which (when a Papist is in a good mood, & disputing with a Pagan) must pass for undeniable demonstrations of the truth of Christianity and the Divinity of the Scriptures. And for the differences in Translations, (either noted by the Papists, or confessed by any of the Protestants,) which the Captain makes a great Flourish with, and other Papists make such triumphs at, they are so petite and trivial, and so little concerning the substance and foundation of Religion or the Scripture, that to me it affords an unquestionable evidence, That our Translations are unblameable in fundamental places, because all their great wits and learned Doctors to this day could not discover any such mistakes, though they have made it their business to find them out. But I shall say no more to this argument in this place, having in the former part of the Treatise spoken to it.

A fifth argument is taken from the seeming contradictions which are in Scripture, not resolveable by the Scripture. Hence (saith the Captain) Reason conceiveth her self to have this infallible demonstration, *viz.* no one who speaketh two things, the one contrary to the other, is infallible in speaking; but the Scripture so speaketh, therefore saith Reason the Scripture is not infallible in speaking. Nay (he might and should have said) the Scripture is not credible in speaking: and therefore say I, by the vertue of this argument the Captain must either acknowledge

knowledge himself an unreasonable man, or an Atheist? I tell you it was good hap, That instead of the Catholick Gentleman he did not meet with an Atheist, for the arguments which convinced him are indifferently calculated for either Meridian. But for all those seeming contradictions, the short Answer is this.

1. That there are no such places, but are capable of convenient reconciliations, as hath been already made good by several learned men both Papists & Protestants, who have professedly treated of those matters, and discovered the vanity of this objection. And if it were granted, That there are some places which men have not yet hit upon the right way of reconciling them, that is no evidence of the impossibility of it, since we can give instances in others, which in former times were thought as insoluble, as any now are, which the learning and diligence of after ages hath fully cleared from all semblance of contradiction.

2. Those seeming contradictions are either reconcileable out of Scripture, or else are but historical difficulties, not at all necessary to salvation. The Captain should do well to put the parts of his discourse together, and see how they agree; because he will not, I will do it for him. The Proposition which Protestants assert, and he attempts to disprove is, That the Scripture is a perfect Rule in things necessary to salvation. This he disproves by instancing in some insoluble difficulties in matters unnecessary to salvation. But we must pardon him, it is *vitium causæ*, the cause affords no better arguments.

A sixth argument is this. *Scripture is no sufficient rule, because it is liable to diverse and contrary expositions.*

An invincible argument, by which a man may dispute all Rules out of the world. *Probatur.* The Decalogue is no rule of life or manners, for the Pharisees understood it one way, Christ another, *Mat.* 5. The Statutes of the Kingdome

are

are no rule; for learned Lawyers differ in their expositions. The Decrees of Popes and Councels are no rule, because lyable to diverse and contrary expositions, so far, that *Gratian* the Compiler of their Canon Law hath one entire Title *De Concordantia discordantium Canonum*, *i. e.* concerning the reconciling of disagreeing Canons. And there is this remarkable difference between the condition of the Romish and our affaires: our differences are in the exposition & accommodation of the Rule, but Popish differences are in the Text and rule it selfe, since there are amongst them not onely diverse and contrary expositions of the same Canon, (which yet is sufficient to take off all their glorying over us, and to bring them to our level) but indeed there are contrary Texts; the decrees and sentences of one Pope directly contrary to another, and one Councel to another, Pope *Stephen* nulls the decrees of *Formosus*, the three next Popes null the decrees of *Stephen*, & re-establish those of *Formosus*. *Sergius* the third comes after, and again nulls *Formosus* his decree. But I will tell you of a greater matter, even no lesse than the Authentical Translation of the Bible: *Sixtus the* 5th sets forth one Bible *An.* 1590, not rashly, but deliberately, with the *advice of his Cardinals, the Assistance of the most learned men of all the Christian world*, (they are his own words.) corrects the errors of the Press with his own hand, imposeth this upon the whole Church. Within 3 years comes *Clemens* the 8th, and he puts forth another Edition, not onely diverse, but in several passages directly contrary to it, (for which I refer the reader either to those two Bibles themselves, or to Dr *James* his *Bellum Papale*, and the Defence of it, where he shall find above a thousand differences between them,) yet *Clemens* suppresseth all other Translations, and enjoynes this for the onely Authentick Translation, & so it is held to this day. The like I might shew of Councels, as it were

easie to furnish the Reader with many instances not of the seeming but real contradictions of Popes and Councels among themselves, and yet (forsooth) the appearance of a contradiction must exauctorate the Scriptures, when real contradictions shall not prejudice the authority of Pope and Councel; so true it is, that some may better steal a Horse than others look over the hedge.

The seventh assault which the Captain makes is this. *If the Scripture be our sole rule and judge, then it was so in the Apostles dayes; and if so, the Authority of the Apostles ceased when they had done writing.*

I answer 1. The Consequence may very well be denied from the Apostles times to ours. The argument is this. Scriptures were not the onely rule, when they were several governours of the Church acknowledged on all hands to be infallible both singly and joyntly: *Ergo*, it is not the onely rule now, when there is no person nor persons in the Church, but who is proved to be fallible. For this is the case at this day, unless the Captain and Mr *Cressy* and the rest will Change their notes, and instead of the Pope and Councel combined, say that the Pope alone is infallible, wherein I desire to understand their minds. 2. The other Consequence hath not a Drachm more of Truth in it: For if the Scripture were the sole rule, yet did not the Apostolical Authority cease. It is no diminution to their Authority to say, they had not a power superior to the Scripture or the word of God, *i.e.* That the *Servant* was not above his Master; the Apostles never pretended to such a power, but rather carried themselves in all things as became those who professed their subjection to the word of their God and Lord. Observe the manner of their proceeding in that great Councel, *Act.* 15. still you shall find the Scripture is the rule, by which they guide the whole debate, and from which they draw their conclusion, as none that read that Chapter can deny. You may

may observe that an Apostle (and he too of so great Authority that he durst reprove St. *Peter* to his face, *Gal.* 2.) makes no scruple of circumscribing his own Authority within the limits of Gods words, and he repeats it *in rei memoriam*. *Though we, or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed*, Gal. 1. 8. I know it is said by Mr *White* in his Apology for Tradition, that this place makes for Tradition rather than for Scripture, and for what the Apostles delivered by word of mouth, not what they left in Writing. To which the reply is most easy, That since the Doctrine delivered by the Apostles, either by Word or Writing is and must be confessed to be of equal Authority (the Councel of *Trent* goes no higher, while they assert, that Scripture and Tradition are to be receive *pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia*, with equal piety and reverence) it consequently follows, that he who renounceth all pretensions of Authority superior, or not subordinate to the one, cannot be said with any colour of sence to challenge a supremacy over the other. The Apostles had not so learned Christ as they who arrogate the name of their Successors have: The power they claimed was not Autocratorical and Despotical, having dominion over the peoples Faith, and being Lords over Gods Heritage, but onely Ministerial, not for destruction, but for edification; not coordinate, but subject unto their Master and his Word.

The last reason he urgeth is, that this opinion of sole Scripture makes every man Judge who take upon them to read and understand the Scripture.

Answ. 1. If it be meant a private Judge, so far as it concernes his own actions; It is true, and that judgment (as I have shewed) the Scripture allowes, and enjoynes to private Christians, & informes us of the sad condition of those, that neglecting their own judgment, give up

themſelves to'a blind obedience to their rulers(an errour common to the Jewes of old and the Papiſts now) aſſuring us this is no excuſe nor ſecurity to them, but *if the blind lead the blind both will fall into the Ditch*, Matth. 15.14.

2. The Papiſts themſelves, however they renounce this principle of every mans being judge in words and ſhew, yet they receive it in truth, & practice upon it, and what ever noiſe they make of Fathers and Councels and the Pope and Church, yet in truth they make particular men the Judges for their own actions. For inſtance if we examine the grouuds and manner of the Converſion (as they miſcall it) of any man to the Romiſh Religion (take *Creſſy* and the Captain for inſtances) we ſhall find the Papiſts that dealt with them, made them Judges. And when the Captain yeilds to that great Argument, *viz.* That if he did not turn Catholick, he had no infallible aſſurance that the Chriſtian Religion was true, was not he himſelf judge of the validity of this Argument? And when *Creſſy* or others are perverted by that great Title of the Churches Authority to which they think all ſhould be ſubject, what do they but make themſelves Judges of this queſtion upon which all depends, whether the Churches Authority be a ſufficient and ſafe Foundation for a mans Faith to reſt upon? So if I come to any Papiſt who is capable of Diſcourſe, I would ask him whether he continues in the Popiſh Communion and believe with reaſon or without it? If he ſay, without reaſon, I ſhall forbear diſcourſing with bruit creatures: If with reaſon, I demand what it is? and here he will enter into a large harangue, concerning the neceſſity of a living and infallible judge for the ending of Controverſies, and that the Pope or Councels is this Judge. In this caſe I ſay, the Romaniſt makes himſelf the judge of the firſt and principal queſtion, upon which all the reſt depend, *viz.*

whether

whether such a Judg be necessary, and whether the Pope or Councel be this Judge: As certainly as St *Paul* argues 1 *Cor.* 6. They that are fit to judge the greater and weightier causes, cannot be unfit to judge the smaller matters.

Thus have I gone over all the Arguments or appearances of reason, which the Captain, or others for him, have collected & what Mr *Cressy* hath pleaded for any of them: I shall in the next place proceed to Answer what farther Arguments I meet with either in Mr *Cressy*, or in that *famous* (or rather *infamous*) *piece*, called *Rushworth's* Dialogues, or in Mr *White's* Apology for Tradition; For doubtlesse *--si Pergama dextra Defendi possent, dextrâ hac defensa fuissent.* And if men of their parts and learning and study in the Controversie can say nothing to purpose against the Scriptures being a perfect rule, I shall with greater security acquiesce in the Truth of the Protestant Doctrine.

Another Argument therefore against the Scriprures is taken from the occasion of writing the Books of the New Testament, of which *Cressy* treats *Sect.* 2. *chap.* 10. And it is observable, that his Argument (however it regularly ought to reach the whole Scripture, yet) is onely (upon the matter) levied against the Epistles in the new Testament, which (saith he) *were never intended to be Written as Institutions or Catechismes, containing an Abridgement of the whole body of Christian Faith for the whole Church, for they were written onely to particular Persons or Congregations (without order to communicate them to the whole Church) and they were written meerly occasionally, because of some false Doctrines, which if those Heretieks had not chanced to have broached, they had never been written: And therefore surely are very improper for a rule of Faith (which must be so true, and clear, and evident, that there can be no rational possibility of contradiction*

or diversity of opinion) and for a man to venture his Soule upon. This is the summe of that discourse (excepting what he saith of the obscurity of the Scriptures which I have considered before.)

For answer, 1. Since Mr *Cressy* requires it in a rule of Faith that it be so true, and clear, and so evident, that there can be no rational possibility of contradiction or diversity of opinion, let him, or rather any other disinteressed or unprejudiced person seriously consider, what hath been discoursed in the former Treatise, and Answer it to his own conscience, as he will give his account to God another day, whether the Popish rule of Faith be so true, and clear, and evident, *&c.* as is pretended to be necessary; or rather, whether it be not so dark & doubtfull, that it is not only rejected by Protestants upon solid and cogent grounds, but also disputed and denied by diverse of their one great Doctors: The question (under favour) is not this, whether our rule be so clear as to admit of no possibility of contradiction, (for who can dream of this that ever heard or read of the Academicks, whose great principle was to contradict every thing, and be confident of nothing?) but whether the Popish rule or ours be better, whether is more true, clear, and evident? And this one would think should not be very difficult to determine. And whether the Protestant rule be so evident, that it may satisfie the Conscience and Reason and prudence of any modest, humble, and diligent enquirer, though it may not silence the clamours of every bold caviller, since there have been (and probably yet are) in the world men so absurdly sceptical, that they have cavilled against the certainty of this Proposition, that Two and Three make Five.

2. The occasionality and particularity of those Writings is no impediment to their being a rule, (though this is a notion the Popish Writers oft mention and vehemently

mently urge upon the simpler sort of men) it neither hinders their being a rule, nor their being a perfect rule, 1. Not the former, the Papists themselves being judges, for they acknowledge it to be *regula partialis*, a part of the rule (I tell you Christ is exceedingly beholden to them, that will acknowledge thus much, and allow him any share in the rule of his Church.) The Councell of *Trent* in its decrees concerning the Canonical Scriptures, notwithstanding this objection ascribes this to the Scriptures no lesse than to Traditions, *That both of them together are the Canon or rule of Faith and manners*, and to both *they allow equal piety and reverence, as I said before*. Will any man say the Law concerning inheritances delivered *Num.* 27. was no Law or rule to the Israelites, because it was delivered upon the extraordinary occasion of *Zelophehads* daughters petition? Or that the Law against the Priests drinking of Wine, when he was to go into the Tabernacle *Levit.* 10. 9. was no rule to the Priests, because delivered peradventure upon the occasion of some intemperance of *Nadab* and *Abihu*? 2. Nor doth this at all hinder the Scriptures being a perfect rule, partly because this Objection concernes onely one part of the New Testament, *viz.* the Apostolical Epistles: But for the Gospels, which of themselves are a sufficient rule (though the addition of the other is an abundant consolation, and a rich mercy.) Mr *Cressy* confesseth *they were written upon no special occasion, but for the common benefit of all succeeding Christians, as an History of his Life and Death, and a summe of the principal points of his Doctrine*, (They are the Authors words, and we need no more to justifie the Scriptures sufficiency) and partly because the occasions, however casual to men; yet were foreseen and foreordained by God to be such as would recurre in all following Ages, and partly because the Apostle extends his thoughts and instructions beyond

the preſent occaſion, upon which, or particular perſon, or perſons, to which he Writes even to following Ages, and conſequently intended them for rules & directions, not onely to them, but to others, yea to all ſucceeding Chriſtians. What elſe means St. *Paul* in charging *Timothy* to keep the command there mentioned – *until the appearing of Chriſt*, 1 Tim. 6. 14. which St. *Paul* knew was at a great diſtance, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 1. if he did not include his Succeſſors? The books of the old Teſtament, at leaſt diverſe of them were written upon ſpecial occaſion, and yet St. *Paul* hath given it under his hand, *That whatſoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning*, Rom. 15. 4. and that all thoſe Scriptures *are profitable* (to us) *for doctrine, reproof*, &c. 2 Tim. 3. 16. An irrefragable Argument that what was written upon a ſpecial occaſion may be a ſtanding rule. And the conſtant univerſal practiſe of all the Antient Fathers & Councels confirming Truths or Duties, & reproving ſins or errors in after ages from the Teſtimonies of the Apoſtolical Epiſtles, doth unqueſtionably evince that they judged them however directed to particular perſons or Churches, yet indeed deſigned for a rule of the Church in all following Generations.

That particular occaſions have given the riſe to ſuch general rules and lawes as have been of perpetual force and uſe, no man that knowes any thing can be ignorant. And that really this was the caſe, and that the principles, Doctrines, and Inſtructions, which are laid down by the Apoſtles in their Epiſtolary Writings, how particular ſoever the occaſion might be that drew them forth, are in their own nature and quality indifferently calculated for, and equally fit to be a guide to other perſons or Churches, needs no proof, but the reading of them, and a reflection upon the daily practiſe of all Preachers as well Popiſh as Proteſtants, which from time to time deduce

ſuch

such documents from them as are singularly useful in whatsoever age or place they live in.

And this may serve Mr *Cressy*'s turne, for I meet with nothing else considerable to this point in his Book. In the next place I shall consider what Mr *Rushworth* saith (who in the opinion of the Romanists is πόλλων ἀντάξιος ἀλλων) in his famed Dialogues: His Arguments against the Scriptures being Judge of Controversies are two: The first is (that which hath been already handled) from the errors and corruptions which must needs be in our Bible, by Copists and Translators: And here he sets his wit upon the rack to devise whatever could be said to blast the credit and the Authority of the Scripture. Here he tels us of the many hazards, doubts, and mistakes, from multitude of Copies, depravations of Hereticks, the Jewes at *Tiberias* and Greeks elsewhere, mistakes of the negligent or ignorant Transcriber, multiplicity of Translations, equivocation of words which are used in several senses according to the variety of times, places, and persons, the ceasing of these Tongues in which Scripture was written, and the quality of the Hebrew and Greek Tongues: He computes how many errors probably might be in the Copies of the Bible, *we may well allow* (saith he) 336 *errors in one Copy, which admitted, you will find the number of errors in all the Copies made since the Apostles time fifteen or sixteen times as many as there are words in the Bible, and so by this account, it would be* 15 *or* 16 *to one of any particular place, that it were not the true Text*, (These are his words *Dialog.* 2. *Sect.* 5.

When I read these and other things of the same tendency, I began to reason with my selfe: Are these the Discourses of *William Rushworth* a Romish Priest? Are these the Arguments which must make men Christians or (which in their sence is all one) Roman Catholicks?

is

Is this the man *that affected the rigour of Mathematicall discourse even in his Controversies, as we may perceive by this work?* for so Mr *White* is pleased to tell us?) Is this the Book that so learned, so ingenious a man as Mr *White* must commend to the World, as *that which was very satisfactory to diverse judicious persons*: Surely 'tis a mistake these are not *Rushworths*, but *Vaninus* his Dialogues, or it is a new found remnant of *Julian* the Apostate, which some unlucky Heretick hath set out under the name of a Romish Priest.

May I be so bold as to aske our Holy Mother the Church of Rome *Num hæc est tunica filii?* Is this thy sonnes voice? No sure, it is some Priest of *Apollo*, bidding defiance to the Christian cause, and striving to render the Holy Scriptures contemptible and ridiculous. But you see what desperate men will do, in a desperate cause, rather than not maintain the Papall Authority, they will subvert the very foundations of Christianity. The Jesuites tell us, that in order to the comming of Antichrist, *Rome* shall turne Pagan: I am in part of their mind, and I think the turne is halfe wrought already: *Ecce signum!* for none short of a Pagan could talke at this rate: The insolency of the Discourse, and confidence of the Disputer, and the applause of his party makes it necessary that I should say something farther by way of Answer.

The first Answer (which alone may silence this impudent Objection) is this: Either this Argument proves nothing against us, or it proves more than the Papists, at least such of them as are not quite out of their wits and consciences too, would have it: let us reflect a little upon the premises, and then forecast the Conclusion, take all his discourse for granted, that by reason of the many mistakes, corruptions, doubts, difficulties, there is nothing but incertitude, that it is fifteen to one of any particular

place,

Place, that it is not the true Text, that it *is as ridiculous to seek the decision of Controversies out of the Bible, as to cut with a Beetle, or to knock with a straw:* These are the Authors words *Dialog.2. Sect.2.* Go say these are faint-hearted fellowes if you can: Give me these honest soules that tell us plainly what they think of the Scriptures, and how little they value them. It were an hard case if all the Churches Adversaries were crafty companions: Now (say I) if these things be true, then certainly it was not without cause, that the Papists forementioned said, that *without the Churches Authority the Scripture were of no more value than Æsops Fables.* Then Father *Cisterus* had good reason to say it was *a Sheath that would admit any Sword*, and *Pamelius* did rightly call it *a Nose of Wax.* If this were true, we might throw all our Bibles into the Fire, for Controversies cannot be decided thence, nor errors detected nor truth evinced, (there's nothing there but uncertainty and darkness) and consequently our sins cannot be reproved, nor duties pressed from the Scripture for the same reason, unless these men will say (who we see will not stick at small matters) that the Copists or Translators errors did happily hit onely upon such places as concerned Controversies (that the Church alone might rule there) not at all on such as concerne duties and sinnes: But if this be true, whence come those high Characters and ample testimonies which the most learned Papists and their Councels have given to the Scripture, that they acknowledge the Scriptures or Bible (and they spake of that which we have) to be the word of God, as much to be reverenced as Tradition it self: How came *Bellarmine* to say of these Books of the Prophets and Apostles. (which we have) *Nihil notius, nihil certius*, &c. *i.e.* nothing is more evident, nothing more certain than that they are the Word of God, and none but a fool can deny them

them credit: *de verbo Dei, lib. 1. c. 2.* Whence it is that the Papists accuse the Protestants of slaunder, for saying they exauctorate the Scripture? How is it that they all pretend the Church may not contradict those very Scriptures which we have? In my opinion the Church of *Rome* was wotully overseen in disputing with the Protestants out of the Scripture, or troubling themselves to answer the Scriptures which Protestants brought; for Mr *Rushworth* hath furnished them with one Answer which will serve for an universall Plaister, therefore I would advise them thus to answer once for all, when a Protestant argues against merit from that Text, *When you have done all that you can, say, you are unprofitable servants*, Luk 17.10. Let them say it was the error of the Copist, and should have been, *profitable servants*. So when it is made a Character of the Apostacy of the latter times *forbidding to marry*, 1 Tim 4 3. it is but saying it was an error of the Copist, that put *forbidding* instead of *commanding*, (a familiar mistake at *Rome*) and then I think the Hereticks are payd home. And so when Christ bids the people *Search the Scriptures*, say the Copist left out the word *not*, it should have been *Search not*, for so Tradition assures us: And so in a thousand other cases, I need no more than give the hint, A word is enough to the wise, as doubtlesse they at *Rome* are in their generation. In short, what do these men and such Arguments tend to, but to debauch the consciences of men, and depreciate the Scriptures, that if men have not so much grace as to abhorre such heathenish discourses, it is enough to make the Scripture as insignificant a Writing, as the most contemptible Pamphlet that ever the World was pester'd with.

I easily apprehend there is one subterfuge, that the Adversaries of the holy Scriptures will think to make an escape at; They will say all this is true, there neither is, nor

nor would be any thing at all certain, or credible, or clear in the Scripture, and the Sacred Writings we now have, but for the Infallibility of the Church, which from infallible Tradition receives them and delivers them to us: But I answer, 1. Wo to us Christians, if all the validity of the Scripture depended upon the infallibility of the Pope or a Councel. Is not this a rare piece of intelligence for Heathens, and Atheists, and scoffers at the Scripture? Are not these men worthy Pillars of the Christian cause? 2. Tradition is not at all concerned in the present dispute, nor Infallibility neither: For suppose the utmost of what can be or is said by the Romanists in this matter *viz.* that by Tradition we are infallibly assured that the Scriptures are the word of God, and that the several Books reputed Canonicall by them are indeed Canonicall, suppose I say we should take all this for granted, what is this to our businesse? Tradition (I hope) doth not infallibly assure them that the Copists committed no errors in Transcribing, nor the Translators in Translating. Tradition did not infallibly assure *Sixtus* the fifth, that his Translation was right, for it assured his Successor *Clement* 8. that it was corrupt in above a thousand places: And when those Popes put forth their Translations it sufficiently appears, and they confesse it, they were not guided by inspiration, but proceeded in all things *more humano*, by collation of Copies, advice of learned men, as I mentioned before out of the Popes own words: And consequently if all Copies be so corrupt that we can have no certainty from them, no more could the Pope and his consultors have from those Copies they used, and therefore are lyable to the same uncertainties.

2. However Mr *Rushworth* pleaseth himselfe in this Argument as if it were unanswerable, and Protestants were mad that did not yield to it; there is one plaine evidence

evidence able to assure any rational man that there is no weight and force in it, because, although these things have been formerly and frequently objected against the Scripture (for Mr *Rushworth* was not the first Antiscripturist) yet diverse of the most learned, and discreet, and resolved Doctors of the Romish Church (who doubtlesse were too wise to let slip any reall advantage, and knew very well how much their cause needed it) do utterly reject and deny it, and together with us do assert the uncorruptednesse of the Books of Scripture now extant among us, as I before proved out of their own words.

3. Here is not any one convincing reason to perswade us of the corruption of the Scripture in substantiall things: All that Mr *Rushworth* offers in liew of those solid Arguments to disprove the Authority and purity of our Bible, is a collection of probabilities (which witty men can easily multiply upon all occasions) to shew, that errors have been frequently committed in Copies and Translations (which no man denies:) But alas how farre short do they fall in proof, if they come to be scanned by any indifferent reason. That which seems to threaten most is the corruption of Hereticks, and we are told of the Jewes at *Tiberias*, who pointed the Bible, when enemies to Christ, and thereby had opportunity to change the whole Text, as also of the Greek Hereticks. I am very willing the cause should be decided by this one point: For (as it is well argued by the Assertors of the Integrity of the Hebrew Text, to whom I refer the Reader, such as *Buxtorf*, and *Glassius*, and many others) if those Jewes have corrupted the Hebrew Bible malitiously to weaken the Christian cause, certainly they have done it in those places which are of greatest importance to evince Christianity: But this it is notoriously known they have not done, since most of the convincing proofs

of

of Christs being the true Messiah are taken out of that very Bible which came out of their hands: And for the Greek and other Hereticks, it is very true that some of them did attempt the corruption of some few Texts of Scripture, but the very attempt made such a noise in the Christian World, and the whole Church took such an alarme at it, that it was presently discover'd and abhorr'd, & they severely censured for it, and even Papists confesse the Doctors of the Church were so vigilant, that there could not be any wilfull and material depravation of the Greek Testament, and the like may be said for the neglects or oversights of Copists. The Christians of former Ages had such an high opinion of the Scriptures necessity and transcendent excellency, that they kept it with all possible care, such exact acquaintance and familiar knowledge of the Scripture, that they could not but discover the last considerable error, such conscientious strictnesse, that they abhorred the least depravation, and such jealousie and watchfulnesse to observe and secure that inestimable treasure, that it cannot with any probability be imagined that substantial corruptions should come into the Texts, and much lesse can the contrary position be taken for demonstration.

4. As there is no cogent reason to argue the Bibles corruption, so there are sufficient evidences of its incorruption: Some I have now mentioned, to which may be added the generall Inconsiderableness of those various lections (which Popish Writers triumph so much in) the sameness for substance in all the citations of Scripture in Authors of diverse Ages, and distant places, and severall languages, the acknowledged incorruptedness of severall other Authors (as to materiall point notwithstanding all the different readings) which yet were not read with that diligence and observation, nor received with

that

that veneration, nor kept with that Religion, nor watched with that jealouſie, nor were the corrupters of them terrified with ſuch threatnings, nor mens own intereſts ſo deeply concerned in the conſervation of their purity, and conſequently were farre more liable to errors or violations than the Scripture: To all which may be added, that (which alone is ſufficient) even the Providence and goodneſſe of God, which as it mercifully gave theſe excellent Writings for mans conduct to eternal bliſſe, ſo it gives us juſt ground for a comfortable and confident expectation that it would preſerve them to our uſe, and not ſuffer theſe (Holy Writings) to ſee corruption. This is ſo material a conſideration even in the judgment of our Adverſaries, that it is their principall Argument, and urged by them with greateſt vehemency and plauſibility for the Churches Authority and Infallibility, becauſe (as they pretend) it doth not conſiſt with the providence and goodneſſe of God to leave his Church without an Infallible guide, ſo that both Papiſts and Proteſtants own the ſolidity of the Principle, and differ onely in the application of it, whileſt they urge it for the infallibility of the Pope and Councell (which as you have ſeen their own Authors are not ſatisfied in) and we urge it for the Infallibility and incorruptibility of the Scriptures, (which all Proteſtants and diverſe Papiſts aſſert.)

Thus I hope I have fully ſatisfied that firſt Argument.

The other Argument which Mr *Ruſhworth* ſuggeſts is taken from the nature of the Books of Scripture: *If a law were to be given in Writing it muſt be thus; Firſt, the common things muſt be commanded, then by degrees they muſt deſcend to particulars, ſtill obſerving that ſeverall matters ſhould be under ſeveral Chapters or divi ſions, and not one piece here, another there, and things, muſt be plaine and diſtinct: From which it is evident enough that the*

Scripture

Scripture was never intended for a Law or Judge of Controversies, because the book is so large, and so many things mingled unappertaining to the substance of our beliefe, as Historical, Epistolar, Mystical, and so many repetitions; and lastly it is left to a meer conjecture what may be the meaning of it. Thus *Rushworth* Dialog. 2. sect. 2.

Is this the Mathematical man? Is this the rigour of Mathematiks? This is enough to make a man forsweare the study of the Mathematicks, if it produce no better Demonstration. We poor Protestants may well be content to submit to the Lawes of these men, for you see they give Lawes to God himself, and it is already enacted in the Conclave of *Rome*, that if God do not speak in Mood and Figure he shall not be heard; and that if he put forth any Law-book wherein he doth not rigorously observe the orders and methods of a Systeme, it shall not be received. Believe me it was a good turne that Mr *Cowel* writ his *Institutiones Juris Anglicani*, wherein he reduced the English Lawes to a method, for else woe had been to our poor Statute-books, and all Records of our Lawes, for as sure as a Club they had been voted to be no Lawes, nor Judges of Controversies between men and men, for so saith our Theological *Enclide* that scornes to speak under a Demonstration, for we know how much more large a book they make then the Bible, and how many things are mingled unappertaining to the substance of our Estates & Lives *&c.* The summe of the Argument is this: The Scripture was not intended for the Law, because it is so large, so miscellaneous, so full of repetitions *&c.* Shall I need to say any more for the answer of such an Argument, wherein there is nothing evident but the Disputers confidence, and the Papists credulity, and the desperateneſſe of their cause.

Ans. 1. If this Argument hold, the Old Testament or the Pentateuch was no *Law* to the Jewes; But

this is false, and it was a Law to the Jewes, *Ergo* the principle is false from which such a conclusion is deduced: The Major I prove from his own words, and besides he particularly disputes against the Old Testaments being a Law. The Minor I hope I shall easily prove: where, to prevent Equivocation or mistakes, take notice I meddle not with the ambiguous terme of JUDGE, we are now disputing, whether it were a Law; Nor do I meddle with that question, whether it be a Law to us, but to the Jewes. This then I assert, that the Old Testament (notwithstanding this objection) was a Law to the Jewes, and a man would think the very mention of the Propositon should cut off all necessity of proof, it is so absurd and portentous a thing to Christian eares to hear so evident end received an assertion questioned: I prove it onely by this Argument; That book by which both people and Priests, and Princes of the Jewes were to be guided, and ruled, & commanded in their Decisions, was certainly a Law to them, But such was the Old Testament. 1. For the people it is plain: They are commanded to *observe to do all the words of this Law that are written in this Book*, *Deut.* 28. 58. And *Moses* makes bold to call it a Law-book, notwithstanding all the mixtures, repetitions, *&c.* and a curse is pronounced to *every one that continued not in all things written in the Book of the Law to do them*, *Gal.* 3.10. and for the guidance of the people, those books were to be read by or to the people, *Deut.* 31.9. *Jos.* 8 35. *Neh.* 8. and diverse other places. 2. For the Princes it is no lesse evident that it was a Law and rule to them, *Jos.* 1.8. *This Book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein.* And *Deut.* 17, 18, 19. *When he sitteth upon the Throne—he shall Write him a Copy of this Law in a book out of that which*

is

to before the Priests, the Levites, and he shall read therein all the dayes of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord,—to keep all the words of this Law and these statutes to do them. Thus it is undeniable, it was a law both to Prince and People, and that is sufficient to overthrow the whole argument. But I adde 3. it was a Law to the Priests too. I do not now dispute whether the people were absolutely tyed to follow the Priests decision, (I think the contrary hath been sufficiently evidenced,) but my present assertion is onely this, The books of Scripture were a law to the Priests, by which they were to be ordered and regulated in their proceedings. The sentence which the Priests were to pronounce, it must be *the sentence of the Law, Deut.* 17. 11. and the Priests are oft censured and condemned for neglecting or transgressing the Law; which plainly shewes it was the law and rule of their proceedings.

Ans. 2. But what shall we say if the Papists themselves deny their own Conclusion, which here they endeavour *tanto molimine* to prove? You will say we have little reason to believe those that do not believe themselves, or to assent to that Conclusion which they deny. To make good this, you must remember the question is not about the Judge, properly so called, but about the Rule or Law, to which we suppose the Judge to be tyed: for if the Scripture had been compiled in the forme of a law with the greatest exquisiteness, this would not have satisfied our Masters the Jesuites, but there must have been another, & that a living Judg of controversies. This premised I thus proceed: Either they of the Church of *Rome* have a Law, by which they regulate all their Decrees and decisions, or they have none: if they say, they have none, then they act lawlesly & arbitrarily, and we have found Antichrist by his Characters ἀνομος, or *lawlesse*, 2 Thes. 2. but if they say, (as they all pretend and professe) they are guided by a Law, then I enquire, what that Law is?

Here it is true they are divided, while some make the judgement of the antient Church and fathers their law, others the Popes Decrees, others the Acts of Councels, but all of them pretend some Law or other, and which opinion soever of their Church they take, (for they have good choice,) either their argument hath no fore against the Scriptures being our Law, or it equally militates against their own Lawes. As, for instance, if they make the judgment of the Fathers their Law, are they not lyable to the same exceptions with the Scripture, of largeneſſe, aliene mixtures, repetitions, &c. And the like may be said of Pope's Decretals, and the Acts of Councels, (which they generally pretend to own as their Law:) & it is no leſſe true of Tradition, of the largeneſſe whereof one may say, (as was formerly said of *Livy*,) *Quas meæ non tota Bibliotheca capit*; for according to the eſtimate which a learned Author of their own makes, (*Charron* by name,) the Scripture is but *minima pars veritatis revelatæ*, the leaſt part of revealed Truth. He that pleaſeth may ſee good ſtore of them collected by that great terror of the Papiſts, *Monlin*, in a Treatiſe of his in French, concerning Traditions. Nay (to put all out of doubt) theſe very men, that argue at this rate, though they do not acquieſce in the Scripture as a Judge, yet they do own it for a Law; they confeſſe the word of God is their Rule and Law, onely they make (as I may say) this law to conſiſt of two Tables, the written and unwritten Word, which you saw the Councel of *Trent* receive with equal piety and reverence. Now certainly they that ſubſcribe to this (as the Papiſts generally do,) they own the Scripture for a Law, though not for a compleat and ſufficient Law: nor doth the inveſting of Tradition with the quality of a Law, deveſt the Scripture of it any more then the addition of new Acts of Parliament doth derogate the name and Authority of a Law from all former Acts and

ſtatutes

ſtatutes, that is, not at all. Much more might be ſaid to ſhew the folly and abſurdity of this argument, but if I ſhould ſpend more words about it, I ſhould both queſtion my own, and too groſly diſtruſt the Readers diſcretion.

And now having done with the Mathematicks, let us come to the Politicks, the beſt argument the Church of *Rome* hath. Politick Mr *White*, who ſeeing their ſcripture arguments in the ſuds, and for the Fathers *pila minantia pilis*, comes in to ſuccour a falling cauſe with politick conſiderations, and moral conjectures, and fine-ſpun probabilities. No man can deny that it was politickly done, when they ſaw their Church could prove nothing, to aſſert, that her bare ſaying was ſufficient, that the teſtimony of the preſent Church, that ſhe holds nothing but what ſhe hath received from Chriſt and the Apoſtles, is ſecurity enough for a Chriſtian Faith. But this notion I have largely examined & I hope Mr *White* will abate ſomething of his confidence in it; therefore I have nothing to do here, but to conſider what be alledged againſt the ſcriptures being a Rule or Judge of Controverſies, and (excepting what hath been before diſcuſſed) I find onely one Argument that can pretend to merit any conſideration, and it is delivered by him *pro more* with great confidence and contempt of his Adverſaries. When the Proteſtants ask the queſtion, as well they may, cannot the Bible make it ſelf be underſtood as well as *Plato* and *Ariſtotle?* (a queſtion which all the wits of the Romane Church, not excluding Mr *White*, were never able to anſwer,) and thence inferre that the Scripture is ſufficiently intelligible, and able to decide Controverſies. Mr *White's* anſwer & argument againſt the Scripture is this: That *this depends upon a moſt falſe ſuppoſition, viz. that the Scripture was written of thoſe controverſies which now are: whereas it is a moſt ſhamleſſe propoſition to ſay, the ſcripture were*

were written, of the controversies long after their date, sprung up in the Christian world: beginning from Genesis to the Apocalypse let them name one Book whose Theme is any now controverted point between Protestants and Catholicks, Apology for Tradition, fifteenth Encounter. And consequently the Scripture is no fit Judge for our Controversies. This, you must know, is the argument of another Mathematical Papists, who cries out of Protestants for resting in probabilities, yet can satisfie himself (or at least pretends to do so) with such absurd & improbable ratiocinations. O the power of prejudice or interest: (for I cannot tell which it is that blinds such men as Mr *White*.) Be of good chear, Protestants, the Papists are upon their last legs: you see their arguments run very low.

The Answer is this in short, (for truly it needs no long nor laborious reply, how much soever Mr *White* is conceited of it.) It is not a most shameless but a most shamefull proposition, to say the Scripture is unable to decide any of those controversies, which are since sprung up in the Christian world. Is there any Freshman in the University ignorant of this, that *Rectum est index sui & obliqui*; that the assertion of a Truth is sufficient for the confutation of all contrary errors, whersoever or whensoever broached. I may say to Mr *White*, as they did to *Moses*, *Wilt thou put out the eyes of these men?* Doth Mr *White* think his Readers would have neither wit nor conscience? I ask whether those passages of Scripture, *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God, Joh.* 1. 1. *who is over all God blessed for ever, Rom.* 9 5 *This is the true God and eternal life, 1 Joh.* 5. 20. *Before Abraham was I am, Joh.* 8. 58. do not solidly and sufficiently confute the late sprung *Socinian* Heresie, and prove Christ's Divinity and præ-existency before his Incarnation? If he say no I will promise him hearty thanks (though not from Christ, nor peradventure from his Vi-

car

car, yet) yet from all the *Socinians* in the world, and then he would do well to answer what *Placæus* & other of the Protestants, or rather (as a demonstration of the unity of the Romish Church) what *Smiglecius*, and others of his brother-Romanists have argued from those places or else let him give us the reason, why his Brethren should play the Knaves, and own and urge those things for solid arguments, which they did not think so. If he say, yea, then down falls all this goodly structure, and Mr *White* must seek for a new prop to declinino *Babel*, and Scripture is not unable to decide Controversies of a later Date. Yet again: I will prove Jesus Christ was not of Mr *White's* mind, for he thought Scripture (yea even such parts of Scripture as were not written upon those Themes or controversies, nor designed against those errors) able to decide supervening Controversies. Thus he confutes the Pharisaical opinion about Divorce, from a Text well nigh as old as the Creation of the World, even the institution of marriage, *Matth.* 19.4,5,6. So he confutes the error of the Sadduces against the resurrection, from a Scripture long before delivered, (and such an one too as seemed to have no respect at all to such an Heresy) *Mat.* 22.29,30, 31,32. May it please this worthy Gentleman to give us leave without offence to prefer our *Saviour's* opinion fore his. I am ashamed to spend time in confuting so senslesse a cavil, but that the reputation of an Author sometimes makes Nonsense passe for an Argument) I need onely advise the Reader to read over the New Testament, and (if he have either reason or conscience) it is impossible he should be of Mr *Whites* mind. Did not the Apostles decide that controversie *Acts* 15. from antient Scriptures, and from such places as seem as irrelative to the matter debated, as any which are urged by any considerable Protestant against the Popish errors? And why then may we not tread in their steps? why may not a

Proteſtant as well conſute the opinion of Juſtification by works (in the Popiſh ſenſe) from that Scripture we conclude we are juſtified by Faith without the works of the Law, as St. *Paul* might and did conſute the ſame doctrine (when held by the Jewes) from that paſſage of Davids, *Bleſſed is the man whoſe iniquities are forgiven*, Rom. 4. If theſe words long before delivered, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him onely ſhalt thou ſerve, Deut* 6.13. were ſufficient to decide the controverſie between Chriſt and the Devil, to conſute the opinion of Devil-worſhip, why may not the ſame words as urged by Chriſt be as ſufficient to decide the controverſie between the Papiſts & us, to conſute the opinion of Image-worſhip? But I am not at leiſure to tranſcribe all the New Teſtament. I cannot think of Mr. *White* (as it is ſaid of many Popiſh Doctors) that he never read over the bible, but I would deſire him once more to read it, & to put on his ſpectacles, and then tell me if he be ſtill of the ſame mind. If this will not do, let him reflect upon the Fathers, whether it was not the univerſal practice of the Fathers to conſute later Hereſies out of the Scripture: this they did either pertinently or ſolidly, (and then it may be done ſtill, or impertinently and fallaciouſly, (and then Mr. *White* makes them meer Juglers.) In a word, as upon ſuppoſition that *Ariſtotle* was authentick, and αὐτοπιστὸς, it were no hard matter out of him to conſute all the new opinions of the modern Philoſophers So the Scriptures being confeſſedly ſuch, it may ſuffice for the confutation of later Hereſies. Laſtly, if all this will not ſerve turn, it is (to uſe his own words) a *ſhameleſs propoſition*, to ſay the Scripture doth not ſpeak of the matters now in Controverſy, between us and the Papiſts; and whoever aſſerts it, either underſtands not what he ſaith, or muſt be preſumed never to have read any of our Proteſtant Controvertiſts, who have fully confuted all the Popiſh errors and hereſies

from

from expreſs Scriptures, or (which is all one) from genuine conſequences evidently deduced from them. Nor doth it matter at all to ſay, the Scripture ſpeaks not of the controverſies at large, ſince it is by all acknowledged, that every part and parcel of *Scripture* is Canonical and Authenticall, and the Papiſts make this the difference between the Divinity of the Scriptures and Conciliary Decrees; that theſe are Divine in the main Concluſion, but not in the premiſes or mediums, but the *Scripture* they ſay is Divine in all, every verſe, every word being Divine; and conſequently if but one verſe of Scripture ſpeak againſt an error, it doth as ſolidly (though not ſo fully) confute that error, as if a whole Booke were written againſt it. For inſtance: that Text, *This is the true God*, if the ſenſe of the words be agreed, (and if they be not, it would do nothing, though an whole Epiſtle were written about it, and ſo farre there is no difference) doth as ſubſtantially confute the *Socinian* Hereſie in that point, as a larger Diſcourſe upon it would do; and therefore Mr *White's* argument is empty and ineffectuall, and muſt go after its fellowes. And ſo all their arguments of any note againſt the Scriptures being Rule or Judge of controverſies are I hope ſufficiently anſwered, and the Proteſtants doctrine or Truth of Chriſt, *viz.* the Scripture is a ſufficient rule or judge of Controverſies, ſtands like a Rock, at which their Waves are daſhed in pieces.

And now I ſhould come to the other part, by poſitive Scriptures and arguments to prove the Scriptures authority and ſufficiency, but this is fully done by many learned Pens, onely becauſe our principal arguments for it are aſſaulted by the Adverſaries I now have to do with, I ſhall therefore conſider their pretenſions againſt the evidence of thoſe places alledged by us in defence of the authority and ſufficiency of the Scriptures; for I am forced by them (againſt my own deſire and inclination) to con-

ſound

ſound theſe two heads, and treat of them together. I know there are ſeverall Text rightly urged by the Proteſtants, and vainly cavilled by the Papiſts: but becauſe the handling of this point was not my firſt nor is my main deſign at preſent, and one ſolid argument or convincing Scripture is as good as a thouſand, and both parties are upon the matter willing their cauſe ſhould ſtand or fall by the verdict of one place, as it doth, or doth not convincingly prove the ſufficiency of the holy Scriptures, and becauſe above all places the Romaniſts moſt eagerly combate this, I ſhall therefore more largely inſiſt upon it, and clear up the force and evidence of it, notwithſtanding all the clouds they caſt before it.

The place is 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16. *From a child thou haſt known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wiſe unto Salvation through faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus. All Scripture is given by inſpiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for inſtruction in righteouſneſſe, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furniſhed to all good works.*

To ingenuous and diſ-intereſted perſons the very reading of theſe words is a ſufficient confutation of the Popiſh opinion: but that you may ſee the Romaniſts have (if no conſcience, yet) ſome wit, they are able to darken the cleareſt Texts, and to perplex what they cannot anſwer. Our arguments from this place are plain and cogent. 1. That which can make a man wiſe unto Salvation is ſufficient for Salvation. 2. That which is ſufficient for the conferring of all thoſe things which are neceſſary to ſalvation, is ſufficient for ſalvation; but ſo is the Scripture. For there are but two things neceſſary to ſalvation, *viz.* knowledg of the Truth & practice of righteouſneſs and holineſſe: and for both theſe the Scripture is ſaid to be ſufficient. 3. That which is ſufficient for a man of God or Miniſter, is much more ſufficient for a private Chri-

Christian: but so is the Scripture: *Ergo*:

But let us see what our Adversaries pretend against this evident place: *Except.* 1. *It is able indeed, but that is through faith,* E. *it is not of it self sufficient,* faith our Captain. *It speaks not of making Timothy a Christian by the Bible, (since it supposeth* Timothy's *being already made a Christian by* Paul's *institutions* viva voce) *but it speaks of the perfecting of his faith, not the first choice of it: as this faith is a belief Christian verities delivered by Oral Tradition;* faith Mr *Cressy* sect. 2. cap. 6. And consonantly to him Mr *White* thus glosseth upon the place: *The Scriptures will contribute to thy salvation, so that thou understand them according to the faith of Jesus Christ, which I have orally delivered unto thee.* Apology for Tradition, Sixteenth Encounter.

Ans. 1. The necessity of Faith is no argument of the Scripture insufficiency. The Scripture is sufficient, i. e. *in genere objecti*, in respect of the object, or Doctrine, or revelation, and yet Faith is necessary *in genere instrumenti*, as an instrument, (for it is plain enough, the faith he speaks of is the grace, not the Doctrine of Faith.) By this Argument Scripture and Tradition together were no perfect rule, for both will not make a man wise unto salvation otherwise then through faith.

Ans. 2. It is falsly supposed, and can never be proved, That the Faith here spoken of is the *fides qua creditur*, or the doctrine of Faith, not *fides qua creditur*, or the grace of Faith, and that by Faith are here intended Christian Verities, delivered by Oral Traditien from St. *Paul*, or the other Apostles: and this Supposition is the Basis of their Answer. The contrary sufficiently appears from diverse considerations. 1. This contradicts the Apostles scope, which apparently is to commend the Scriptures, as able to make wise to Salvation *&c.* But this were no commendation at all to say, they together with such Christian verities are sufficient for salvation, for according to

this

this argument it might be said of any one verse in all the Old Testament, what is here said of all the Scriptures viz. That that Verse together with Faith, *i.e.* with the Christian verities delivered by Oral Tradition, is sufficient for Salvation, which no Papist will deny: and therefore that Answer is absurd.

2. *Timothy's* faith here supposed, is of the same kind with the Faith of his Mother and Grandmother, 2 Tim. 1.5. *When I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy Grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice.* Was the faith of his Grandmother to the Christian Verities delivered by Oral Tradition from the Apostles after she was dead?

3. It is not said, *The Scriptures are able..with the faith*, but *through the faith*, not σὺν πίστει, but διὰ πίστεως, which plainly shewes, that this Faith is not another object distinct from the Scriptures, but an instrument to apply the Scriptures; especially if we consider a parallel place, Heb. 4.2. *The word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith, i.e.* with the grace of Faith: for none can be so senseless, as to think they were damned for want of oral Tradition.

4. The Faith here spoken of is together with the scriptures sufficient for salvation; and so is the grace of faith: But the Dogmatical belief of Christian Verities deliver'd by Tradition, together with the scriptures, is not sufficient for Salvation, as the Papists confesse: *E.* the grace of Faith is the thing here spoken of.

5. The Faith here spoken of is a thing distinct and totally differing from the Scriptures, and not at all coincident with them. But the Christian Verities or Traditions delivered by the Apostles were not things so different, but coincident with the Scripture, as evidently appears from *Acts* 26.22. where *St. Paul in terminis* professeth, *he said* (Preached) *none other things, than those which the Prophets*

and

and Moſes did ſay ſhould come. But I would have you to wit, that the Church of *Rome* knew what *Paul* Preached better than himſelf: a plain evidence of their Infallibility.

Exc. 2. *By this argument the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament* (for of them he ſpeaks) *are ſufficient for ſalvation, and ſo the New Teſtament is not neceſſary.* So the Captain p.29. and Creſſy *ubi ſuprà.*

Anſ. 1. It is very true, the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament were in thoſe times ſufficient for ſalvation: This appears from the place now cited *Acts* 26.22. compared with *Acts* 20 27. where S. *Paul* ſaith, *he delivered the whole counſel of God.* Hence I argue: The whole counſel of God was delivered by *St Paul*, and is ſufficient for ſalvation: but all that St *Paul* delivered was is *Moſes* and in the Prophets, *Acts* 26.22. If the Old Teſtament was deficient in any doctrine it was that which the New Teſtament ſeems to ſupply, *viz.* the doctrine of Chriſt, and yet the Old Teſtament was ſufficient to teach Chriſt; for it did both inſtruct men about the Perſon, and Office, and work of the Meſſias, (as our Divines do abundantly prove againſt the Jewes, to whom I refer the Reader for the proof of it) and alſo did ſufficiently prove that Jeſus was the Chriſt, as appears undeniably from *Acts* 18.28. and conſequently there was no defect, but a ſufficiency (for that time and condition of affaires) even in the old Teſtament in things neceſſary to ſalvation.

A third Exception they take againſt our argument from this place is, *That it ſpeaks only of perfection after faith, but here is no queſtion about the firſt choice of faith, much leſſe is there any mention of convincing* (in foro contentioſo) *about which is all our controverſy.* Thus Mr *White's* Apology for Tradition, 16 Encounter.

Anſ. Since then all our controverſy is about that, whether Scriptures are ſo convincing, it will be worth our while to examine the point; for it is not my deſire to catch

at

at little advantages, but to attaque the Adversary in his strongest Fort.

But before I come to the proof, let us inquire into the meaning of the Phrase; What it is for the Scripture to be convincing *in foro contentioso*, i. e. in way of disputation I take it for granted, he is not so absurd as to expect that the Scripture should be so convincing, as actually to convince, and satisfy, and silence the most importunate and unreasonable Caviller. In that sence the clearest demonstration in the Mathematicks is not convincing but without doubt Mr. *White* takes his Apology, and so his Treatise *de fide*, and Mr. *Rushworth's* Dialogues to be convincing Discourses, because though they do not actually convince the stubborn Heretick, yet they are *apta nata* to convince them, there is so much evidence in them, as may & ought to satisfy any understanding, unconcerned, inquisitive, and prudent adversary: and in this sense I do assert, that the Scriptures are convincing *in foro contentioso* (which is the great thing Mr. *White* sticks at:) I prove it thus.

1. The Scriptures make a man of God, *i.e.* the Minister (as they acknowledg) perfect, and throughly furnished to every work, but this is one of his chief works, to convince Gain-sayers, *Tit.* 1 9. *Ergo*, Scripture furnisheth him with convincing arguments.

2. The Scripture is here expressely said to be profitable among other things for Conviction, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, first *for doctrine*, i.e. for the confirmation of Truths, then *for conviction*, (for so the Greek word more properly signifies then *for reproof*, which is mentioned in the next particular, *for correction*) or for refution of errors. But surely Scripture were not profitable for conviction, if it be insufficient to attain that end, and be unconvincing: nay more, Scripture is not profitable for Doctrine, if it onely beget conjectures and opinions, and doth not give

solid

solid and satisfying evidence of its doctrines: and if it do evidently assert or prove a Truth, it must by consequence as evidently convince and confute the contrary error. For example: If any Scripture positively assert, that Christ is the true God, and equal with the Father, (as *de facto* it doth,) doth not the same Scripture sufficiently convince even *in foro contentioso* the *Socinian* Hereticks, who make Christ but a Creature, and inferior to the Father? Neither let him tell me of their cavils against such places, for so *Anaxagoras* did cavill against those that said Snow was white, (and gave a reason for it, saith *Tully*, because the water of which it had its rise was Black,) yet no man I think will deny that there is convincing evidence (even in *foro contentioso*) of its whiteness.

3. The Scripture was convincing formerly, and therefore it is so still, (for I do not know that it hath lost any of its vertue.) Christ proved himself to be the Messias out of the Scriptures in sundry places, and I think Mr *White* will not deny, that all Christ's arguments were convincing. So Christ proves his Lordship and Divinity out of the Scriptures, and I think convincingly, (for his Adversaries were not able to answer him a word,) out of the Psalmes Read *Matth.* 22.42, *&c.* When *Peter* and *Paul* disputed against the Jewes out of the Scripture, and proved (as they did) out of the Scriptures, that Jesus whom they crucified was Lord and Christ; I would know, whether their Scripture-proofs were solid and convincing, or no: if they deny it, they make the Apostles deceivers, & wresters of the Scriptures; if they affirm, then Scripture is convincing. Once more: we read *Act.* 18 28 of *Apollos*, that he mightily convinced the Jewes, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. I am ashamed to mention more arguments in so clear a cause: and yet we must believe these men against our senses, and reason, & conscience, that the Scriptures are not able to convince men

men *in foro contentioso*; and Mr *White* (who sometimes writes as if he believed an everlasting state) dares hazard it upon such false and frivolous suppositions.

Excep. 4. *The word* (All Scripture) *must signifie either every Scripture, as the Original word* πᾶς *ought to be rendred, and then all Scripture save one Book is useless, or all the Scriptures that ever were, (and then we have them not,) or all that were then written, (and then all since written are superfluous,) or all that we now have.* Epist. pag. 293.0.

Answ. The Text speaks not of every Scripture, but of all the Scriptures that then were. As for the the word πᾶς two things are evident enough.

1. That it may be taken collectively, and the use of the word will warrant it. I see the Captaine is grown a Grecian, therefore I shall desire him to look onely into two places which his masters the Rhemists interpret *collectivè*, not *distributivè*: Mat. 8 32. πᾶσα ἀγέλη *the whole herd*, not *every herd*, and πᾶσα πόλις *the whole city*, v. 34.

2. That it must be so taken here, our Adversaries being judges, or else this confessed inconvenience will follow, That any one verse of the Scripture is profitable and sufficient to all these purposes: nor doth it at all follow, that all the rest are superfluous, because not precisely necessary. The Pentateuch alone was a sufficient Law for the Jewes, yet none will say the Books of the Prophets concerning the explication or application of that Law were superfluous.

Except. 5. *He sayes not the Scriptures are sufficient, but onely profitable.* Cressy.

Ans. 1. He saith they are profitable πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν *for every good work*, and what is so, is undoubtedly sufficient.

2. He saith they are profitable, so far as to make one wise to salvation, and I think that is sufficient.

3. He

2. He saith they are profitable to the producing of all things necessary to salvation, which are acknowledged to be onely two, Faith, and Life. and they are profitable to both of them. 1. For Doctrine, *i.e.* the demonstration of the Truth. 2. for conviction or reproofe, *i. e.* the confutation of errors: 3. for correction, *i.e.* the reproof of sins: 4. for instruction in righteousnesse, or the discovery of Duties. And what is thus every way profitable, cannot with any colour be charged with insufficiency.

Excep 6. *It is a clear case, the Apostle speaks of the benefits of Scripture, when explicated and applied by a preacher.*

Answ. 1. By this Argument all these high and various *elogiums*, which are here so emphatically given to *all the Scripture*, do as truly belong to any one verse of Scripture. By this, those two words, *Dic Ecclesiæ*, Tell the Church, are able to make one wise to salvation, & furnished to every good work, *&c.* for so they are or may be (through God's blessing) if explicated and applyed by an able Preacher. So those words, *Abraham begat Isaac*, are able to all these mentioned purposes, *viz*, if explicated and applied. So you see the Church of *Rome* is grown supertatively orthodox, for they who ere while would not allow all the Scripture to be sufficient, are now so abundantly satisfied in the point, that they allow any one verse in the Bible (not excluding *Toby went, and his dog followed him*) to be sufficient.

This, I hope, may suffice for the vindication of this Text, wherein I have been the larger, because it is most plaine & impregnable to our purpose; and sufficient of it selfe to decide the whole controversie. I shall not concern my selfe, or trouble the Reader with the vindication of other Texts to the same purpose, (which are many, and considerable, & with great facility defensible against all the Romish assaults) because to him that submits to the authority and self-evidencing light of the Text, that la-

bour is superfluous, and to him whose Conscience will suffer his wit to quarrel against such forcible and cleare expressions, and arguments, as this Text affords, it is frustraneous. And therefore upon the evidence that hath been delivered, I shall take the boldnesse to conclude, That not the Church, but the Scripture is the sufficient Rule and infallible Guide, by which we are to be regulated in all things pertaining to Faith or Godlinesse.

FINIS.

The INDEX.

The Introduction. *Pag.* 1.

CHAP. 1.

The popes infallibile Authority is no ſufficient foundation of Faith, and is a meer nullity. *pag.* 2.

CHAP. 2.

Scripture is no ſufficient foundation of faith to a Papiſt according to their principles proved out of their prime authors. §§ 1,2,3,4.

The Scripture alleadged by them for the popes infallible authority examined in general. §. 5.6.

In particular

Matth. 16.18. Thou art *Peter*. §.7.8.9.

Joh. 21. Feed my ſheep §. 10.

Luk. 22. I have prayed, *&c.* §. 11.

Deut. 17.11.12. §. 12.

CHAP. 3.

Of the infallible authority of the Fathers.

Aſſerted by the papiſts. *ſect.* 1.

Diſproved,

1. By the ſame arguments by which the papiſts derogate from the authority of Scripture. *ſect.* 2.3.

2. Becauſe infallibility is the churches prerogative. *ſect.* 4.

3. The Fathers diſclaime it. §. 5.

Exc. But the Fathers where they agree are infallible

Anſwered. *ſect.* 6. *pag.* 46.

4. The Papiſts themſelves diſown the infallibilitie of the Fathers though conſenting. *ſect.* 7.8.9.

CHAP. 4.

Of the authoritie and infallibility of the Church and Councels §. 1.

Aſſerted by papiſts. *ſect.* 2.

Diſproved,

1. There is no foundation for it in Tradition. *ſect.* 3.4.

For 1. If the Fathers deliver ſuch a Tradition they are not infallible. *ſect.* 5.

Exc. Fathers conſenting are infallible.

Anſw. We cannot at this diſtance underſtand their conſent. *ibid.*

2. If the ancients did believe the infallibility of Councels

cels, they might do it upon the account of Scripture not Tradition. *sect.* 6.

3. It doth not appear that the Fathers believed the infallibility of Councels.
Proved by answering the arguments of *Bellarm.* and S. *Clar.* *sect.* 7.8.9.10.
Of S. *Austins* judgment. §. 10. 11.

4. It appears that the Fathers believed the fallibility of councels. *sect.* 12.

2. There is no foundation for this infallibility in Scripture.
Proved in general. *sect.* 13.
In particular by the examination of the Texts urged for it.
1. *Tim.* 3.15. *sect.* 14.
Math. 18.17. Hear the Church and *Luk.* 10.16. *sect.* 15.
That the Church and Ministers are not to be heard in all things with an implicit faith.
1. Christ denies this to the Apostles.
2. Else people cannot sin in obeying their Pastours.
3. People are allowed to examine their Teachers Doctrines.
Joh. 16.3. He shall guide you into all truth. *sect.* 16.
Acts. 15.28. *sect.* 17.
Math. 28. *sect.* 18. *pag.* 103.
3. The Papists themselves disown the infallibility of councels. *sect.* 20.
An examination of that evasion and pretended agreement Of papists in this, that the Pope and Councel together are infallible. *sect.* 21.

4. The infallibility of their Councels destroyed by the consideration of those things which papists themselves requite in infallible Councels; 22
1. That they be general. *sect.* 23.
2. That they have the consent and approbation of the whole Church. *sect.* 24.
3. That they be rightly constituted and ordered and guided by honesty, piety, and love to Truth. *sect.* 25.
Exc. Pope, councels, Fathers, Scripture conjoyned make the Church infallible.
Answered. *sect.* 26.

CHAP. 5.

Of Oral Tradition and the Testimony of the present Church,
This new opinion represented in the words of its Authors and abettors. *sect.* 1.
Refuted.
1. Hereby they both settle the protestant foundation of faith, & overthrow their own. §. 2, 3.
2. This makes oral Tradition more certain than writing, 2. gainst the judgment of God and all men. *sect.* 4. *p.* 140
3. Errors may come in, and have come in to the Church under pretence of Tradition. *sect.* 5.
4. Traditionary proofs disowned;
1. By the Prophets and Jewes of

of old. §.6.
Exc. The Law of Christians is written in their hearts not Tables.
Answered. *sect.*7.
2. By Christ and his Apostles. *Sect.*8.
Exc. 2 *Thes.* 2.15. *ibid.*
5. Scripture proof is necessary for confirmation of Doctrines in the judgment of the Fathers. *Sect.*
6. Oral Tradition hath deceived the Romanists themselves. *Sect.*13. *pag.*158.
Exc. They are not deceived. in great points *de fide* Answered. *ib.*
7. Though experience sufficiently proves the deceit of this argument, yet it is particularly shewed how error might creep in this way. §.11.
It might creep in by degrees. *Sect.*12.
1. Christians might mistake the mind of their Predecessors. *Sect.*13. *pag* 166.
1. There was no certaine way for the third age to know the Doctrines of the second. *ib.*
2. Instances given of mens misunderstanding the Doctrine of the precedent Age. *Sect.*14.
3. The words of our predecessors may be remembred and the sence perverted. *Sect.*15.
4. Some ages were horribly ignorant and careless Exemplified in the tenth age. §.16, 17. 18.
And few Writers §. 19.
2. Christians might knowingly recede from the Doctrines of their Ancestors.
1. From Gods just judgment. *Sect.*21.
2. Because they did believe their predecessors erred. *Sect.*22.
3. Eminent persons might corrupt the Doctrine received from their Ancestors and did so. *Sect.*23.
Exemplified in a forgery of the Popes. *ib.*
P. This way of Tradition disproved by the practice of the Church of Rome which introduceth Doctrines, not descending by Tradition, but new. *sect.*24.
Exemplified in two Doctrines
The immaculate conception of the Blessed *Virgin.*
And the Canon of the Scripture. *ibid.*

CHAP. 6.

Of Miracles and the motives of credibility.
The opinion represented in their words, §.1.
Refuted
1. Other Churches have a juster claime to these marks than Rome. *Sect.*3,4,5,6,7.
2. Diverse of them are not marks of the Church. *Sect,*8-9.10.
The Character of miracles specially

cially considered and their arguments thence confuted.
2. Christs Miracles prove Romes Fallibility. *sect.*12.
2. Miracles are not simply and universally to be believed. Proved by Arguments. §.13. 14.15,16,17.18
3. Miracles onely prove the verity of the Doctrine, not the Infallibility of the person. §.19.
4. Miracles do not always prove the verity of a Doctrine, for they may be, and have been done by Heathens and Hereticks
Which is acknowledged by the learned Papists. *Sect.*10.
5. Miracles are pleaded by the Romanists either impertinently or falsely. *Sect.*21.
6. Protestans may plead Miracles as well as Papists. *Sect.*22.
A briefe recapitulation of the several pretensions and resolutions of Faith among the Romanists. *Sect.*23.
Another plea from Gods providence, and the supposed necessity of a living infallible judge. *Sect.*25,6,27,28.

CHAP. 7.

Of the Solidity of the Protestants Foundation of Faith.
The Protestants have a solid foundation of Faith in the Scriptures, the Papists themselves being judges. *Sect.*1.
Their learned men acknowledg
1. That the Scripture is, and may be known to be the word of God without the Churches Testimony, and by its own light. *Sect.*2.
2. That the Books of Scripture are not corrupted in essential and necessary points. §.3.
3. That the sence of Scripture in things necessary may be understood. §.4.
Except. Protestants build upon an humane Translation answered. §.5.6,7,8.
Protestants freed from the pretended circle of proving Scripture by the spirit, and the spirit by the Scripture. §.9.10, 11.12.
A consideration of that pretence offered at by some Romanists, That the Churches authority is a sufficient foundation for faith without infallibillity. §.13.

To

To the APPENDIX.

THe occasion of it. pag. 1.
The occasion of *Everards* pretended conversion to Popery. 5.
The Arguments which perverted him, *viz.* that a Protestant cannot be infallibly assured of the truth of Christian Religion. considered and examined. p. 8. to the 12.
Of the Doctrine of Infallibillity as stated by Mr *Cressy*. ib.
Papists and Protestants grant, that such a Doctrine ought to have the greatest evidence that such things can bear. 14.
Whether the Doctrine of Infallibility be evidently proved.
The negative defended.
1. Because it is not evident to the Papists themselves 15
They are divided about it notwithstanding their pretended agreement. 16.
Their haltings in the point, and Mr *Cressy's* shuffling discovered. 18
2. Because their reasons to defend it are weak.
Mr *Cressy's* arguments examined.
Arg. 1. Take away Infallibillity and you destroy all authority. 21.
2. From the *Anathema's* of Councels. 23.
3. From the promises of Infallibility made to the Church. pag. 25. to. 30.
4. No unity without Infallibility. 30.
Other considerations against infallibillity.
1. The Texts and arguments alledged, either prove nothing, or more than Mr *Cressy* would have. 33.
2. If a Pope and Councel together were infallible, yet now they have no infallibillity in the Church of Rome. ib.
Character of the last Pope drawn by a Papist, and the popes confession that he never studied Divinity. 34.
The grounds of the Faith of Protestants stated, and the pretented differences among Protestants reconciled. p. 36. to 45
Captain *Everards* arguments against the judgment of reason considered, 45.
Everards arguments against Scriptures, being a perfect rule and judge of Controversies examined and answered, (1 which is the great argument of the Papists) because it doth not answer its end nor reconcile the dissenters 47.
2. Some books of Scripture are lost. 50.
3. A rule must be plain but Scripture is darke. 52.
2. *Pet.* 3, 16. Vindicated. 52.
Severall particulars wherein the Scripture is said to be darke considered,

considered.
1. About the numbers of Sacraments, p.54.
2. About the number of Canonicall books. 55.
3. About the incorruption of Scripture. 55
4. About the sence of Scripture 57.
5. About fundamental points. 59.
4. Protestants have not the Originals, but onely the Translations. 63.
5. There are contradictions in Scripture. 65.
6. Scripture is liable to contrary Exposition. 66.
7. Scripture was not judge in the Apostles dayes. 68.
8. This makes every man judge. 69.
Another argument of *Cressy's*, taken from hence, that Scripture was written upon particular occasions. 71.
Rushworth's two great and applauded arguments in his Dialogues refuted.
The first taken from the great uncertainty and corruption of of Texts in our Bibles. *p.75 to 82.*
The second from the Methods of Lawes and Law-givers. 82.
Mr *White's* argument, *viz.* That Scripture was not Written about the present Controversies, considered and answered. 88.
The Scriptures authority and sufficiency, argued only from one Text.
2. *Tim.* 3. 15, 16. Vindicated from diverse exceptions of Captaine *Everard*, Mr *Cressy* and Mr *White*. *p.92. ad finem.*

FINIS.